

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1359993

BABYLONIA

INDIA

RESEARCHES
IN
BIBLICAL
ARCHÆOLOGY

VOLUME III, PART I

A Forgotten Religion

BY

OLOF A. TOFFTEEN, Ph. D.

PUBLISHED BY
THE ACADEMIC PRESS
5220 GLENWOOD AVE.
CHICAGO, ILL.

ARABIA

EGYPT

GREECE



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

From the library of
LLOYD E. SMITH

A Forgotten Religion

BT

201

755

By

OLOF A. TOFFTEEN, PH.D.

RECTOR OF THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTE.

AUTHOR OF *The Historic Exodus, Ancient Chronology,*
Researches in Assyrian and Babylonian Geography, etc.

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE ACADEMIC PRESS

5220 GLENWOOD AVE.

1926

BT
201
T55

COPYRIGHT 1926, BY
OLOF A. TOFFTEEN

Composed and Printed by
H. O. WINDAHL
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.

Preface.

This book is offered and should be regarded as an introduction to a series of similar volumes, dealing with the fundamentals of Religion. The present volume is the result of several lectures held before classes in Religion at the Academic Institute and of Sunday lectures before the Academic Assembly of said Institute. These lectures represent not only an honest search for Truth but the conviction that dogmatic opinions and views on the Religion of the Nazarene have to be recast or cast away, and the fundamentals restated in plain language, before that Religion can become a real force in modern life and of vital value for the upbuilding of the Kingdom. Ecclesiasticism is a dead issue to thinking men of the unchurched masses of our day. It is to this class of men, moving in modern thought, to which the present lectures are addressed. We know that they will be welcomed by many of them. We know also that the ideas here presented, though new and startling to many, will call forth serious inquiry. The time is past for dogmas to choke human minds. The slogan is, What are the facts of Religion?

The notes are excerpts from the author's lectures on Biblical Archaeology. Our only apology is, that we could not quote more fully.

The author maintains the views on Biblical Criticism, which he has held for years. None of the arguments raised against his criticism of the Evolutionary Hypothesis has had enough cogency to shake his position on those questions, or even to make a modification of his views necessary. Of course, we cannot expect mummified scholarship to appreciate facts. Still, facts, not abuse, determine the value of a theory. The hypothesis of a double Exodus stands unaltered. The dates of Ancient Chronology, first presented by the present writer, are now generally accepted by the scientific world. Evidence for the author's views on Old Testament sources and dialects is given in this volume in the notes on the Creation and Paradise stories and the text dealing with the Circumcision. These speak for themselves.

Olof A. Tofteen.

Chicago, Ill., April 15, 1926.

CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 1
CHAPTER I, In the Temple of Jerusalem	" 3
The Japhethite Race in Palestine	" 6
The Jewish Race	" 6
Japheth	" 7
Bethlehem-Ephrathah	" 8
CHAPTER II, The Sources	" 10
Paulinism	" 23
CHAPTER III, Christology	" 24
Chronology of the Birth of Jesus	" 35
Gabriel	" 37
Joseph	" 38
Betrothed	" 39
Parthenogenesis	" 41
Mariam	" 42
Nazareth	" 43
CHAPTER IV, The Virgin-Birth	" 44
Son of God	" 66
Son of Man	" 68
The Creation Story	" 74
CHAPTER V, Birth of Jesus	" 82
Circumcision	" 92
Nazarenes	" 99
CHAPTER VI, Birth of The Son of God	" 100
The Paradise Story	" 106
CHAPTER VII, Birth of the Messiah	" 113
John the Baptist	" 115
The Rock	" 123
Angels	" 126
Galilee	" 128

Introduction.

A Forgotten Religion!

If something is forgotten, and we wish to remember and make use of it, the general procedure is to go to the source from which the information came and there refresh the memory, because something forgotten is not necessarily lost.

A forgotten religion does not need to mean that such a religion is entirely lost. It is forgotten, when no one makes use of it, or if its essential features have been replaced by new ingredients foreign to its nature. It may be, that the new features to some people seem better than the old, but these features make it a new religion, and the original religion becomes forgotten and dormant, in spite of claims to the contrary, and in spite of the fact that some names of the original religion may have survived in the substitute, or been used as a dupe for covering the differences.

It is not an entirely new hypothesis that the Christian religion is a substitute for the religion of Jesus of Nazareth. Many have claimed this in all ages, and many still believe so, though they may not have been able to state the issue clearly, or to have advanced the proper evidence for it. The very fact that so many denominations have arisen, can not be ascribed wholly to the cunning of the devil, as Eusebius claimed, because the real reason for it lies deeper and is to be found in Christianity itself. Truth can not be divided, and where divisions arise, truth has not laid the foundation, nor built the temple. The fact that churches have always divided and subdivided, and are still dividing, is ample proof of their lack, or twisting, of truth. It is true, that one of The Twelve also became a traitor, but he became so because of money. And so long as denominations are built up with money, their true character will be read in the sign of Judas.

But we are not very much interested in the substitute or

substitutes, except in so far as we notice what profound failures they are. Our chief interest is centered in that forgotten religion, which we want to bring forward again into daylight and, if possible, make it as vital and as sublime, in healing power, in light and glory, as it was when the Master himself was healing, teaching, and serving upon this earth.

This forgotten religion can be recovered only from the source whence it came forth, Truth, and can be verified only by the source that describes its *Way*. We have, therefore, two sources to deal with, Truth and Way. The Master pointed to a third source, Life, the purpose of his religion.

In the search for the essentials of this forgotten religion, we must inquire into the origin of the author of this religion, how this author was prepared for his ministry, and how that ministry was performed. These three questions must be answered, before we can understand that ministry. If it then should be found that the author of this religion was a preacher of a religion of light, and a healer, that he taught no doctrines, but "built" up an array of symbols which were realized in a number of mysteries, and that he was a real king while he was upon earth, the founder of a kingdom over which he was the ruler, then that religion has been forgotten, because nothing like it exists now upon earth. The substitute, which has been made for it, is less a shadow than a phantom of the original.

CHAPTER I.

In the Temple of Jerusalem.

A boy, about twelve years and ten months of age, sat one early April day in the temple court of Jerusalem. This happened in the year 9 A.D. He was listening to learned men, the Rabbinical "teachers" of that time, and asking them "amazing" questions which confused the "teachers" and astounded the bystanders that gathered in groups around them. He had been there every day for two weeks, no one knowing who he was or whence he had come. It was a marvel even that he would choose, day after day, to come to the temple, when plays and games were so tempting these sunny days in the beautiful surroundings of the Holy City. And how well versed he was, in the "Law" and the traditions, for a boy of his age!

The visitors to the temple, who casually noticed him sitting in this distinguished crowd, assumed him, of course, to be a Jewish boy. True, there were also "God-fearing" Greeks who came to the temple, but those were admitted only into the "Court of the Gentiles", and rarely was a boy seen in that place. The sacred court, with the great brazen altar and the immense laver, was scrupulously reserved for those of the Circumcision, and it was in this court this boy was sitting. He must, therefore, be a Jewish boy. All took that for granted, and the amazement of the crowd was heightened because of this boy's unusual interest in holy things and the way he asked his questions. These betrayed a depth and an insight which astonished and even confused those venerable "teachers."

Still, the looks of this boy—Jehoshua was his name, though the Greeks pronounced the name Jesus—were not Jewish at all. His eyes were blue and mild—just as their traditions pictured the eyes of angels. His hair was a mass

of jet-black curls, his forehead was high, his face was oval instead of the broad Amorite face seen everywhere else in this Jewish crowd, his nose was straight instead of the usual aquiline, or rather hooked, Hattite nose of the common Jews, and his complexion was *ruddy and white*. In looks he was not Jewish at all. There was something remarkable in his whole bearing, something of exquisite finesse, majesty, unusual attractiveness, which the glow of his face and mild eyes heightened into an irresistible charm. In stature and appearance he was not like a boy born of a Jew, but he shared with the best of the Jews their love for the temple, their zeal for their holy Scriptures, and their Messianic hopes, surpassing and outdistancing them in love and zeal and the longing for the Messiah.

This boy was Jesus of Nazareth, of the House of David from Bethlehem - *Ephrathah*.

A fair-looking woman entered the Temple court, followed by her husband. Her eyes searched the multitude, then fastening them on the boy she rushed to him, saying, "Child, why hast thou dealt thus with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing" (Lk 2:48).

The boy looked up to her, then at the man, and with an unfeigned mien of surprise he answered firmly, almost spurning them, "How is that? Have ye sought *me*? Wist ye not that I must be in the things of *my* Father?" (Lk 2:49).

It was their turn to become surprised. His mother tried to explain that they had sought for him three days, in the caravan, along the road, in Jerusalem. She was bewildered. What did he mean? Was he repudiating his father, right to his face, in that crowd?

Luke tells us that "they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. But he went down with them to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them; and his mother kept all things in her heart" (Lk 2:50-51). Of course Luke could scarcely say more than what his source told him, and this source must be different from the one which he used in the story of the Conception (Lk 1:26-38). Joseph knew the facts,

of course, but he did not say anything, and Mary "kept all things in her heart." Did she really not understand him, or did she only feign not to do so?

Whose son was he? His mother ought to know. And she called him the son of her husband, and said that Joseph and she were his "parents" (Lk 2:43), using a word *goneis*, which means parenthood. But that was said before her son had raised the issue of who really was his father.

The issue which was raised in the temple that day, when Jesus asserted his heavenly descent, has never been settled satisfactorily and is still the issue of the day. Some believe that Jesus was born the Son of God, entirely divine, and nothing human in him, except his bodily form.

Others assert with equal emphasis, that Jesus was conceived and born a common human being, like all other men, that there was nothing divine in him or about him, and that it was not until his baptism, that The Spirit came over him, by which he was anointed and became Son of God and Messiah. These two titles are regarded by these men as identical and supposed to denote one and the same thing. These men hold, furthermore, that the stories in the Gospels, dealing with some phase of a supernatural conception and birth of Jesus, are the results of a late tradition which knew nothing, or did not want to know anything, of the real facts in regard to the birth of Jesus.

Most of the churches rely upon the dogma of the Virgin-birth of Jesus, according to which Holy Spirit conceived him, and a pure virgin brought him forth in such a manner that she did not loose her virginity by that act. Some churches go even further than this and add to this dogma a new dogma, that this virgin, Mary, at no subsequent time lost her virginity, that her marriage with Joseph never was completed, or if it was completed, there never was a carnal union between the two, and that the brothers and sisters of Jesus, of whom the Gospels and in fact much of the New Testament literature repeatedly speak, were nothing but cousins or relatives of Jesus.

The whole issue is still open and at present extremely vital. We shall, therefore, review the more important testimony of the New Testament writers on this subject, and do this with an open mind, having no particular dogma or opinion to defend, and taking nothing for granted until proved.

THE JAPHETHITE RACE IN PALESTINE. Not only the monuments but Hebrew literature prove the existence of a blond, dolicocephalic race in Palestine, and the probability is that this "white" race had existed there before the Semites entered that land. The Song of Songs furnishes an admirable description of this race and proves that descendants of this people were still living in Palestine at the late date, when these "songs" were written:

"My lover is white and ruddy, conspicuous among myriads. His head is most fine gold, his curls are flowing, black as a raven. His eyes are like doves by wa- terbrooks,	washed in milk, set in fullness. His cheeks are as bowls of bal- sam, towers of sweet herbs; his lips are lilies, dropping liquid myrrh." (Cant 5:10-13.)
---	---

THE JEWISH RACE. The Jews of Judea and Jerusalem, at the beginning of our era, were not descendants of the Hebrews, or even of the Israelites that formed the Davidic kingdom. These Jews were the descendants of those poor and miserable Jews which had been taken into captivity in Babylonia by Nebuchadrezzar II, in the years 597 and 586 B.C., and had been permitted to return under Zerubbabel and Ezra in 536 and 458 B.C., because they were unable to support themselves in Babylonia and assimilate with the refined Babylonians, as their better educated brethren did, who never returned to Judea.

Their prophet in Babylonia was Hezekiel, and he describes the descent of these Jews as follows: "Again the word of Jahveh came unto me, saying, Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations, and say, Thus says the Lord God unto Jerusalem: Thine origin and thy nativity is of the land of the Canaanite; the Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was an Hattite"(Ez 16:1-3). Ethnographical traits of the Amorites and Hattites can be studied to utmost satisfaction on both Egyptian, Hattite, and Assyro-Babylonian monuments. These studies show that the Jews are not descended from pure Semitic blood, though there may be some streaks of Semitic blood in them, but from a

stock formed by the amalgamation of races like the Amorite-Hattite-Canaanitic nations.

JAPHET was a "son" of Noah (Gn 5:32; 6:10; 7:13; 10:1-2), the brother of Sem and Ham, and the "father" of Gomer (the Cimmerians and the Cymric people), Magog, Madai (the Medians), Javan (the Ionians), Meshek (the Mushki of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Russian people represented by the Muscovite), Tubal (Tabali, Tibareni, Tiflis), and Tiras (the Etruscans). "Japhet" represents the "sentum" group of the Aryan peoples, and the name is identical with the Greek Japetus, the father of Prometheus.

The Bible knows also of a "Japheth the Elder" (Gn 10:21), that is, an earlier Japhethite race which had lived in Palestine, and which belonged to the "centum" group of the Indo-European stock of people. A reminiscence of this settlement has been preserved in an early Hebrew folk-song:

"Japet is the god of Japheth,
Who has dwelt in the tents of Sem,
And Canaan has been his slave" (Gn 9:27).

"Japet" is an old Semitic reading of the signs in the name of god A-E, where the second sign also has the value bit, pit. This name could therefore be read both Ja-Ve (Latin Jove, Hebrew Jahveh), and Ja-Pit (Greek Japet and Hebrew Japheth).

Traces of the settlement of an Indo-European people of the "centum" group can be seen in a number of old place names of Palestine:

Gad was the old name of Gilead, east of the Jordan. It became later on the name of a "son" and a tribe of Israel (Gn 35:26; Nu 26:15, 18, 32, and often). Though this people found it expedient to join the confederacy of "Israel", it may still have been a non-Semitic people, and even though this people might have been Semitic, it lies near at hand to assume that it took its name from the country in which it settled.

In Hebrew the word gad means "troop", but the Hebrew had also a foreign word Gad, which was interpreted with "luck", "good fortune". There was also in ancient Palestine a god by the name "Gad" which name was interpreted in the same way. This name is not Semitic, and is most likely cognate with the Indo-European root gad, gath, and goth, "God" and "good". This means that this people designated themselves as the "good", the "Gods", or "Sons of the Gods".

It was in this land that Jacob "wrestled with God", where-

fore he called the place **Penuel**, "Face of God" (Gn 32:30-31; Jd 8:8,9,17).

Karkor (Jd 8:10) was a fortress which lay close to Penuel. The name should be compared with Gothic **karkar**, "prison", and Latin **carcer**.

Karka (Josh 15:3) was located in the Negeb. The name is probably mutilated from **Karkor**.

Gudgodah (Dt 10:7) was also a place-name in the Negeb, probably a mountain. The name, which is not Semitic, should be compared with the name **Gad**. If the two names are related, this name means mountain of the "Good God".

Sidon is represented as the "firstborn" of Canaan (Gn 10:15). In the Amarna period the name was written **Zi-tu-na**, "Town of Life", from pre-Sumeric **Zi**, Greek **ze**, "life", and Icel. **tun**, "walled-in place", Goth. **tun**, "fence", Engl. "town". Several other places in ancient Palestine had names compounded with **tun**, and some places were simply called **Tuna** and **Duna**.

Zion is not a Semitic word, and is best explained from pre-Sumerian **Zi-Unu**, "Dwelling of Life", from **Zi**, "Life", and **Unu**, "Dwelling" (cf. Germ. **wohn-en** Icel. **Vang**), the pre-Sumerian name of **Erech**, modern **Warka**.

Ephrathah. Joseph was a descendant of the house of David, from Bethlehem Ephrathah. Mary belonged to the same family. An attempt has been made by some scholars to make Mary belong to the tribe of Levi and the House of Aaron, because in Lk 1:36 she is called a "kinswoman" of Elizabeth who was a daughter of Aaron (Lk 1:5). But "kinswoman", Greek **syggenes**, denotes "relative" by race as well as by tribe. All the Jews were "kinsfolk", as Paul states expressly, when he says that all the Jews were his "kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom 9:3).

The pre-Semitic name of Bethlehem was Ephrathah, an old Aryan, specifically old Gothic word, compounded of **E** and **Frat**. **E** is related to Goth. and Icel. **Ve**, pre-Sumerian **E**, "house", "temple", found also in the Hebrew **hai-cal**, "temple", from pre-Sumerian **E-GAL**, "great house". **Frat** is related to Germ. "Brot" Engl. "bread." Hebrew **Beth-lehem**, "House of bread", is simply a translation of **Ephrath**.

The old name **Ephrath** was still used in Patriarchal times. Rachel died and was buried in this city (Gn 35:16,19). In Gn

35:19 a gloss was added, saying that Ephrath is the same as Bethlehem, which is repeated in Gn 48:7.

Ruth's first husband was an "Ephrathite" of Bethlehem-Judah (Ru 1:1-2), and her second husband, Boaz, was likewise a citizen of Ephrathah (Ru 4:11). This Boaz became the great-grandfather of David, the line running Boaz-Obed-Jesse-David (Ru 4:18-22). In I Chr 4:4 it is said that "Ephrathah" was the father of Bethlehem", which means that Ephrath was the older name of this city.

Micah prophesied that the Messianic ruler was to be born in Bethlehem-Ephrathah: "But thou, Bethlehem-Ephrathah, which art little to be among the families of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting" (Mi 5:2).

In the Old Testament pains are repeatedly taken to denote David, and his son, the Messiah, as descending not merely from Bethlehem-Judah, but specifically to be of Ephrathite stock. David and Jesus are therefore not Jews at all, but of the old Japhet-Japetus race from Ephrathah. In David, and therefore also in Jesus, there was an admixture of Moabitic blood through Ruth, as well as that of the Egyptian Hyksos blood through Rahab. From its name we conclude that Ephrathah had been an old settlement from Gutium east of the Tigris, which had colonies in several places in Palestine, Asia Minor, and on Crete.

JESUS WAS OF PURE GOTHIC STOCK FROM OLD GUT-IUM. Perhaps the Jewish hatred of Jesus would abate a little, if the Jews could realize that Jesus was not a Jew. Neither his father nor his mother were of Jewish descent. Nor was there anything specific Jewish about him. He did not speak the Jewish language, but Aramaic and Greek. He did not learn his craftsmanship from the Jews, for though the Jewish race has always been known to be crafty, it has not been a race of craftsmen, still less of "builders." He had not learned Truth from the Jews, nor the worship of the Father. He happened to live a part of his life in "Galilee of the Gentiles" to which the Jews never had a claim. Their title to the land of Judah is not too good. The only thing of which Jesus can be accused is the fact that he has shown the world what a horrible thing a Pharisee is, and in that respect Jews stand a fair comparison with other races. Jesus was not a Jew.

CHAPTER II.

The Sources.

The sources which throw light upon the life and work of Jesus are scanty and by no means of equal value. They may be divided into three groups, Primary, Apostolic, and Subapostolic.

1. The Primary sources consist of the original elements of our canonical Gospels, the fragments preserved of the Gospels to the Hebrews and to the Egyptians, the Book of Revelation, fragments of Gospels and Logia lately discovered in Egypt, the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, the works of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the elder, some monuments from that time, and especially those which elucidate ancient mysteries.

2. The Apostolic sources consist of the speeches of Peter in the Book of Acts, First Epistle of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of Paul, and the Gnostic writings of the first century.

3. The Subapostolic sources comprise the rest of the books of the New Testament, the latter half of the Acts of the Apostles, the introductions to the Gospels, the Gnostic literature, the myths and the literature on other religions of the second century, the literature dealing with early Christian and Jewish sects, and references in the Fathers of the Church up to the time of Eusebius.

The Synoptic Sources.

The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are called the Synoptic Gospels, because they treat the ministry of Jesus from the same viewpoint. Often they are dependent upon one another in the scope of material, and now and again they exhibit verbal agreement. This agreement, however, is confined to certain sections. In other sections only two of

these Gospels agree, and in still other sections they are entirely independent of and diverge from one another.

When the material of each section is scrutinized, it appears that several sources have been used in the composition of the Gospels. And these sources are by no means of equal date or value. The difference in value of this material does not depend so much on the date, when each source was written, as on the viewpoint and purpose of each source. All the Gospels were written within a period of thirty years, 65-95 A. D., and though this period witnessed a rapid development of faith and Church, this short span of time alone cannot explain all the divergences between these sources, and some of these divergences are so enormous that they amount to contradictions.

It is true that the sources cover a larger period of time than the dates of the Gospels do, for the *Logia* or "Oracles of the Lord" existed certainly as early as 50 A.D., or before, since Seneca knew of them, and other sources did not appear until after the death of the apostles, which the prologue to Luke's Gospel proves. But the different schools of thought among the disciples fostered an independent growth of the traditions after the time that separate centers, communities, and brotherhoods were established. Each center came to harbor a special set of traditions, which naturally came to grow and assume proportions peculiar to the needs of that center.

Since the delivery of the Gospel was and had to be oral from the beginning, it could not be avoided that such traditions came to grow among disciples who had not become partakers of the mysteries, which alone could give to the oral delivery a set and permanent form. Unhampered tradition will grow, and would be reshaped, as soon as doctrines began to replace the story of the Master's life and the symbolism of the mysteries. Paul had no use for the story of Jesus' life, except the crucifixion and the resurrection, since his philosophy of religion was substituted for the history of Jesus' ministry. This was in reality the opening of the way for new

doctrines and philosophies, and very soon each prominent teacher of the new religion had his own way, or system of philosophy and doctrines, which had to be supported by a tradition on the ministry and life of Jesus. The next step was to fit the "way" to the tradition.

Of course, new traditions could not be invented for this purpose, so long as the faith of the disciples consisted in the "following" of the Master, and this "following" continued to the close of the Apostolic age among the disciples of the primitive Brotherhood. But outside the Brotherhood the Christian conscience had no scruples in adorning the traditions of the Master and of the apostles, so long as this growth of traditions did not clash with well-established facts. The new doctrines needed traditions to support them, and did not hesitate to create such traditions.

The earliest group of Gospel sources is recognized by simplicity of language, and freedom from doctrinal bias, and presents the life of the Master as a historic perspective. These sources should be accepted at their face value, and to this group belong most of Mark's Gospel and the *Logia*, or "Oracles", in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew.

A second group of sources contains also material of great historical value, but it is colored by tendencies, that is, the documents from which this material was taken, were written with a certain aim, sometimes for controversial purposes, though mostly in order to prove that a certain prophecy had been fulfilled. The "didactic" sources may be historically as valuable as the material of the "life" stories in the first group, but in each case the story has to be entangled from the setting in which the author has placed such a story. To this group belongs the more important historical material in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, which has no parallels in the Gospel of Mark.

There was a third group of documents, the material of which is purely "doctrinal", that is, embellishments of some story from the life of the Master for the purpose of explaining some special doctrine which was emphasized in certain

localities. The stories themselves are not mere fancies, but rest upon some historic fact, but this fact has been torn from its historical connection, generally it has been adorned and enlarged, and then applied to prove a doctrine or "teaching". In this manner any whim of a teacher may be clothed in the garb of a story from the life of the Master and appear as a fundamental truth. To this group belong the stories of the Virgin-birth, the references to the "Church", some of the resurrection stories, and glosses and interpolations within older material. The "doctrinal" material is found exclusively in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, and that in Matthew betrays quite a late period of the Apostolic age, if it is not purely Subapostolic.

The material in the Synoptic Gospels is therefore not of equal value, and has to be sifted and searched in the light of contemporary history, before it can be used for either historical or didactic purposes.

The Gospel of Mark.

Papias tells us that Mark wrote his Gospel after he had heard Peter preach his sermons on the life of Jesus. Mark was for some time a disciple of Peter, whereby he got unusual opportunities to learn the history of the latter part of Jesus' ministry from an eyewitness. This Gospel bears also all the marks, even in details, of historic accuracy and appreciable frankness. There is not the slightest reason to assume that Mark would or could misrepresent anything that he had heard Peter tell. Since he wrote his Gospel not later than thirty years after the crucifixion, on or before 65 A.D., when he was still a young man, not more than forty-five years of age, or less, we cannot believe that he could have forgotten any details of the history of an admired friend of the family, which had been pictured so vividly by Peter before so faithful a follower and disciple as Mark was.

It is very fortunate that Peter's sermons on the life of Jesus came to the ears of Mark, the profound admirer of Jesus. Mark had access to the testimony of other eyewit-

nesses, and even his own mother had for some time been a follower of Jesus. He was himself firm and unyielding in anything that concerned the truth about Jesus, and when he wrote his Gospel, which became the first of the written Gospels, his work on the life of Jesus must in all ages be rated as of utmost historic value, because it was written within thirty years after crucifixion, by a man who had access to most of the facts.

Tradition has uniformly ascribed the evangelization of Egypt to Mark, and there is no valid reason to doubt this tradition. If so, it is but natural to assume that Mark's teaching came to influence the Alexandrian school of thought.

The Gospel of John.

The Gospel of John was written sometime between 85 and 100 A.D., when the Synoptic Gospels had been written and were in circulation. Some interpolations may have been inserted in these Gospels and the introductions to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke may have been added after the appearance of John's Gospel, but modern scholarship is practically unanimous in asserting, that the essential parts of the Synoptic Gospels were in circulation and lay before John, when he wrote the fourth Gospel.

John was an eyewitness of Jesus. He had leaned on his bosom, and had access to him and his thoughts as no one else, not even Peter excepted. He was the *beloved disciple* whom "Jesus loved". He could learn and had learned the secrets about Jesus, if any there were, and his testimony was and is such that it must be accepted without contest.

It is admitted on all hands, that this Gospel differs enormously and in essentials from the Synoptics in its presentation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Admitting this difference, we must look for a reason for it. On examination we find that, although all the four Gospels deal with Christ, the Synoptics present him as "the anointed Jesus of Nazareth", while the fourth Gospel sees in him also the Son of God.

Why should Matthew and Peter differ from John in their

presentation of the Gospel of Jesus? They had all been followers of Jesus, been his companions day and night, heard him preach in public to the masses and teach his disciples in private, seen his conduct in private life and his wonders which he performed publicly before the people. Was he not the same Jesus all the time? Can he be accused of showing a scintilla of duplicity? Did he tell John more than he told Matthew and Peter? or did John see more of him than Peter and Matthew did?

Let it be strictly understood that Jesus' public appearance consisted only in preaching, healing, and the performing of a certain class of miracles. And his preaching, or addressing of multitudes, consisted exclusively of parables (Mt 13: 55). His theme of preaching was constantly the Kingdom, and he spoke to the people on that subject only under the veiled form of the parable. Publicly he never spoke of himself otherwise than as the Son of Man—and no one understood what he meant by that phrase (Jh 12: 34). The subjects dealing with the Son of God and Messiah were never touched by him before the crowds, except when he wanted his antagonists to admit certain facts, or when he stood accused before Pilate and the Sanhedrin for having assumed these titles and having claimed himself to be both the Son of God and Messiah. Furthermore, his disciples were permitted only to tell or repeat publicly what Jesus had said or done publicly, and nothing else.

Privately Jesus taught his disciples the meaning of what he had preached. This was purely private information for the disciples, and his followers were permitted to repeat this only to new disciples. The teaching of Jesus was always given in private, and his disciples were strictly forbidden to tell it, except within circles of disciples. Matthew, Mark, Peter, John, nor any one else had not the slightest right to divulge an iota of this teaching to the public. It was solely for disciples. The Gospels were therefore published exclusively for circles of disciples. Before the resurrection, the secrets dealing with Messiah and the Son of God were imparted only from mouth to

ear. This became a habit of the disciples, and although after the resurrection they were permitted to make public use of these particular secrets, these were usually told only within closed chambers.

That accounts for the fact, that Matthew, Mark, and Luke refrained from mentioning the divinity and Messiahship of Jesus in their Gospels. It was not needed in public sermons at that time.

Beside preaching and teaching about the Kingdom, Jesus conveyed also fellowship in the Kingdom by means of certain mysteries which he had instituted. Admission to these mysteries was given only to inner circles of disciples, as *The Twelve*, *The Seventy*. Sometimes only a single disciple was present. At other times three of them were admitted, as were Peter and the sons of Zebedee at the Transfiguration. Now and then all the disciples were present. Being mysteries, they could not be divulged, either orally or in writing. Initiation alone into the mysteries would reveal their sublime significance. They were all Messianic in character, and each circle of initiated was called a *Koinonia*, "Brotherhood." Naturally, the people got to hear of these brotherhoods, though a secret of them never leaked out. And not a single word of these secrets was recorded in the Gospels, though we are told of the existence of the "Mysteries of the Kingdom" (Mt 13:11; Mk 4:11; Lk 8:9), and some of them are mentioned by name in the Book of Revelation. Others were referred to as "Signs", and many of the parables and the miracles described, especially in John, are but veiled stories dealing with these mysteries.

The secrecy about the "teaching" was not so strict, because the teaching was the property of all the disciples. As was said above, a part of this teaching was released for public use after the resurrection (Mk 8:30; 9:9).

Why, then, did John divulge some parts of this teaching, when Matthew and Peter were keeping it secret? Our answer is that these secrets were revealed, when exigencies of the time required it. Mark said nothing about the Annunciation, though he undoubtedly knew all about it. Matthew and Luke

had to present this subject publicly, because their age needed to hear this secret. John felt it his duty to tell about the Son of God, Messiah, Light, Life, Logos, Pleroma, Shepherd, Lamb of God, Water of Life, Birth from Above, Blood, Flesh. His age needed this information, and for the following reason:

There were always converts, so-called "non-followers", who refused to follow the disciples or The Twelve. "They went out from us, but they were not of us" (Jh 2:19). It was so even during the Master's ministry; and when his disciples complained of it, Mark records this answer of Jesus: "Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a 'power' in my Name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me" (Mk 9:39). This man possessed only "power"—he had no "authority", consequently he had not been initiated into the mysteries.

Paul became such a convert. He, too, wanted to come into possession of these secrets, but he did not want to consult the disciples of Jesus. After his conversion he says, "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were *apostles* before me: but I went away into Arabia" (Gal 1:16-17). There he apparently received his "Gospel" (Gal 1:12), for after a few days he returned to Damascus and began to preach. Again, eight years later, he was seized up into Paradise and "heard unspeakable words" (2 Cor 12:4), "which it is not lawful for a man to utter." Consequently he speaks of a number of mysteries which had been revealed to him (Eph 1:9; 3:3,4,9; 5:32; 6:19, and often). We have Paul's own testimony that he did not receive his preaching, teaching, or mysteries from man, at any rate, not from the apostles or disciples of Jesus. Whatever he knew, he knew nothing of the secrets and mysteries that were guarded by The Twelve.

The disciples had *sacramenta*, secret and sacred "oaths" for initiation into mysteries. Paul promulgated his "revelations" in the form of mystic faith and mystic ceremonies, which *Paulinism* took up and developed as symbolic acts, whereupon the Church lay hold of them and made them into "sacraments" in the sense that these are now celebrated. Of

course, modern sacraments have no relation, in form or contents, with the mysteries which the Master instituted.

But the public knew little or nothing of the differences between the mysteries of the "followers" and those of the "non-followers." All were Messianic, and all pretended to cluster about Jesus of Nazareth. A critical period for the followers of Jesus came, and John was left alone, who could speak of those things as "that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Logos of Life" (1 Jh 1:1). The danger was too great for him to keep silent any longer. He decided to write his Gospel on the Son of God and the Messiah, and tell as much as he consistently could do, without betraying the confidence and secrets vested in him.

What John wrote was nothing new to Matthew, Peter, Mark, or any other disciple; but when their Gospels were written, the conditions had not yet become such as to make it necessary to divulge before the public what John felt himself in duty bound to do.

The Gospel of John is inestimable, the greatest boon which the followers of Jesus have received, to help them on to enter the Kingdom.

Fragments of Lost Logia.

We know that the first attempts of the disciples to keep alive the memory of Jesus, beside the oral proclamation, was to record his "Sayings" or *Logia*. From the testimony of Papias we learn that the original Gospel of Matthew consisted only in Sayings of Jesus.

This has been confirmed by discoveries lately made in Egypt. The rubbish heaps of that country, especially in Oxyrhynchus, have yielded a large number of papyri fragments, several of which record "Sayings of Jesus." These fragments have been published by Greenfell and Hunt under the auspices of the Graeco-Roman Branch of the Egypt Exploration Fund. Because of their immense value to students of the life of Jesus, we present herewith some of these *Logia*.

Introduction.

These are the (wonderful?) words which Jesus the living (Word) spake to . . . and to Thomas, and he said unto (them), Every one that hearkens to these words shall never taste of death.

Logia.

1. Jesus says, Let not him who seeks . . . cease until he finds, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the Kingdom, and having reached the Kingdom he shall rest.

2. Jesus says, (Ye ask? who are) those that draw us (to the Kingdom, if) the Kingdom is in heaven? . . . the fowls of the air, and all the beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, (these are they which draw) you, and the Kingdom (of heaven) is within you; and whosoever shall know himself, shall find it. (Strive therefore?) to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the Father who is . . . ye shall know yourselves . . . and ye are the city . . .

3. Jesus says, A man shall not hesitate . . . to ask . . . concerning the place (in the Kingdom), because many that are first shall be last, and the last first, and (they shall have eternal life?).

4. Jesus says, Everything that is not before thy face, and that which is hidden from thee, shall be revealed to thee. For there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, nor buried which shall not be raised.

5. His disciples question him and say, How shall we fast and how shall we (pray?) . . . and what (commandment) shall we keep . . . Jesus says . . . do not . . . of Truth . . . which is hidden . . . blessed is he . . .

6. (Jesus says) . . . and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.

7. Jesus says, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the Kingdom of God; and except ye make the sabbath a real sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.

8. Jesus says, I stood in the midst of the world and in the flesh I was seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieves over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart and see not, poor, and see not their poverty.

9. Jesus says, Wherever there are (two), they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there am I.

10. Jesus says, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither does a physician work cures upon them that know him.

11. Jesus says, A city built upon the top of a high hill and stablished, can neither fall nor be hid.

12. Jesus says, Thou hearest with one ear, (but the other shall be closed).

Fragment of a Lost Gospel.

A fragment of a lost Gospel has also been found at the same place and published by the same organization.

“(Take no thought) from morning until even nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat or for your raiment what ye shall put on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye (lack?) . . . Who could add to your stature? He himself will give you your garment.

His disciples say unto him, “When wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee?” He says, “When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed . . .”

He said, “The key (of knowledge) ye hid; ye entered not in yourselves and to them that were entering in ye opened not . . .”

Fragments of Other Lost Gospels.

We add some quotations found in early Christian writers from Gospels which have been lost.

Gospel to the Egyptians.

"When Salome asked how long death would prevail, the Lord said, So long as ye women bear children. For I have come to destroy the works of the female. Then Salome said to him, Did I therefore well in bearing no children? The Lord answered and said, Eat every herb, but eat not that which has bitterness. When Salome asked when those things about which she questioned should be made known, the Lord said, When ye trample upon the garment of shame; when the two become one, and the male with the female neither male nor female." (Clement of Alexandria).

"For the Lord himself being asked by some one when his Kingdom should come, said, When the two shall be one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female neither male nor female" (Second Epistle of Clement XII 2).

Gospel to the Hebrews.

"He that wonders shall reign; and he that reigns shall rest. Look with wonder at that which is before you."

"Never be joyful except when ye shall look on your brother in love."

"Take hold, handle me, and see that I am not a demon, nor without a body."

"Just now my Mother, Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor."

Other Gospel Fragments.

"On the same day, having seen one working on the sabbath, he said to him, O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the Law" (Cod D, after Lk 6:4).

"They who wish to see me and to lay hold on my Kingdom must receive me by affliction and suffering" (Barn. Ep. 7).

"Jesus said to his disciples, Ask great things, and the small shall be added unto you; and ask heavenly things, and the earthly shall be added unto you" (Orig. de Orat. 2).

"The Saviour himself says, He who is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the Kingdom" (Orig. Hom. in Jer. III).

"Keep the flesh pure and the seal unspotted, that we may receive eternal life" (Clem. Rom. Ep. 2: 12).

"My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house. We remember our Lord and Master, how he said to us: "Keep my mysteries for me and for the sons of my house" (Clem. Alex. Strom. 5: 10).

The Word says to us, "Should any one for this reason kiss a second time because she pleased him"; and adds, "Men must therefore act thus with extreme caution in the kiss, as knowing that, if perchance it should be sullied by thought, it would place them out of the pale of eternal life" (Athenag. Legat. 33).

FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER. The first epistle of Peter was written at the time of the beginning of a general persecution of the Christians in Asia Minor, and reflects an age when there were large numbers of the "elect" in the provinces of the northern part of that peninsula. It is natural to think of the persecution under Domitian, 92-94 A.D., though some period during the Flavian emperors might also fit. This means that if the apostle Peter wrote this epistle, he did not suffer martyrdom during the Neroinc persecution, 64 A.D., because this persecution was confined to Rome. It is not denied that Peter has been in Rome and even preached the Gospel there and won numerous converts, but the tradition of his martyrdom in Rome is late and unreliable, dating from the time of Tertullian. There is every reason to assume that Peter passed away at a ripe age, as most of the apostles did, and he may very well have founded the assemblies in Asia Minor to whom this Epistle was written, and that he or Silvanus wrote it, when Peter was quite old.

It is also worth noticing that at the late date, when this epistle was written, the author does not once use the title "church", not even to denote a local assembly, though he moves freely among a number of other titles, like "flock", "holy nation", "royal priesthood", "the elect", etc. Was he studiously avoiding the term "church?" Nor does he know anything of the Pauline hierarchy, using only the term "elders", which was also a Johannine term, and which apparently originated in the

Brotherhood of Jerusalem. The reference to "Christians" (1 Pet 4:16), may exclude Peter as the author of this Epistle.

DATE OF EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. In Hb 9:8-10, which deals with the temple of Jerusalem, the present tense is used, but in the following verses, Hb 9:11-12, which deals with the sufferings of Jesus, the past tense is used. The temple was then still standing, when this epistle was written. It must therefore have been written before 70 A.D.

PAULINISM. The teaching of Paul was too philosophical to be grasped by the common people and too inconsistent to be appreciated by learned men. Furthermore, his ways and personality were too domineering and even insulting to the Jews to win recruits from that quarter. But when the zeal had ebbed away, which he had created, and Christianity, of which he also was the father, could replace the Nazarenes or crowd them out, his party swung into power and became the Church. The name was already at hand, and Paul had provided it with a hierarchy. His teaching was therefore adapted to meet the needs of his Church. This modified teaching of Paul has been called Paulinism.

If Paul had written down his gospel, probably no other Gospels would have been needed or accepted in the Canon. Perhaps he intended his Epistle to the Romans to serve as his gospel. As it is, he still domineers the New Testament field. It is useless to attempt to reconcile Paulinism with the Gospels or with the religion of Jesus. The chasm is too great to be bridged.

Many passages in sources of a late date, incorporated in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, reflect Paulinism, and almost the whole of the Book of the Acts is colored by Paulinism. This modified Paulinism is also reflected in some late New Testament writings, like the epistles of James, Jude, and 2 Peter.

The question is not whether Paul was a Christian, for he was undoubtedly a very zealous Christian. No, the "Pauline problem" concerns the question, in what degree Paul and Paulinism agree with the Gospel which Jesus preached, and to what extent Paul built his "faith" and "Church" upon the work and life of Jesus.

Perhaps it may be necessary to say, that much, very much, in Paul's writings agrees perfectly with the teaching of Jesus. That is accepted, of course, without question.

CHAPTER III.

Christology.

John took pains to tell us that the very reason for writing his Gospel was this: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (Jh 20:30-31). According to John the fundamentals of Truth and the condition for receiving "Life" rests upon the certainty of a human Saviour who is the bearer both of Christ, and of The Son of God.

Matthew has preserved a saying of Peter, taken from a late source. Jesus had asked, "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" to which Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt 16:13,16). Mark (8:29) says that the answer was simply "Messiah" which Luke (9:20) renders with "the Anointed of God." The two answers are practically identical, for *Messiah* is the Hebrew word, and *Christ* the Greek word for our "anointed." Both Matthew and John agree on the nature of Jesus, a doctrine that is confirmed by many passages in the New Testament. We must therefore conclude that Mark emphasized the human and Messianic natures of Jesus because it was of fundamental importance to man, as he saw it.

Pauline Christology.

The Pauline Christology was taught by Paul, and its views are reflected in the writings and books commonly ascribed to Paul. His theology is constantly in the process of development, but his characteristic tenets, in any phase of his development, differ so widely from those of any other of the New Testament writers, that there is no difficulty in deciding what is Pauline or not. For to Paul must be ascribed

the origin of the name "Christian" and of the "Church", the ecclesiastical doctrines on the sacraments, the ascetic life, antinomianism, and the doctrines on the spirit Christ, the "Pauline faith", "deliverance", "flesh" and "spirit", the resurrection of the spirit, justification, glossolaly, and the hierarchy. He had a Gospel of his own, not received from man, but by direct revelation, as he asserts (Gal 1: 11-12).

The use of the names Jesus and Christ in the writings of Paul is characteristic of his Christology. He uses the name Jesus alone some thirteen times. Eighteen times he uses the expression "Lord Jesus", which is equivalent to his term "Lord Jesus Christ." About one hundred and ninety times he uses the expression "Jesus Christ", and "Christ" alone occurs some two hundred and seventeen times.

The occurrence of the name Jesus, as used by Paul, makes only about three percent of the references in which he uses the name Christ, and is found only three times in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians (1: 10; 4: 14 *bis*), when his Christology had as yet not crystallized, once in the Epistle to the Romans (3: 26), and nine times in the Epistles to the Corinthians (1 Cor 12: 3; 2 Cor 4: 5, 10 *bis*, 11 *bis*, 14 *bis*; 11: 4), in which passage he defended himself against other teachers in Corinth, who apparently had preached "Jesus" in that city and had called attention to the profound difference between the religion of Jesus and the religion of Christ as presented by Paul. Though forced to take his stand in regard to the teaching of the Apostles on Jesus, he had nothing to yield, nor was he ready to make any compromises. The following is a short resumé of Paul's Christology:

Jesus was the Son of the true God (1 Thes 1: 10), because he was Jesus Christ, "the anointed Jesus": "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (1 Cor 2: 2). "God is faithful, through whom ye were called into the Brotherhood of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Cor 1: 9).

This Jesus was the Christ, "for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel: not in wisdom of words, lest

the cross of Christ should be made void"(1 Cor 1:17). Thus we learn that it was Christ who died upon the cross and who sent Paul to preach.

"When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under Law"(Gal 4:4). Paul knew of no Virgin-birth. The eternal, pre-existent Son of God was born of a common woman, "under Law", "in the likeness of flesh of sin"(Rom 8:3), "who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh"(Rom 1:3).

This teaching of Paul is too plain to be misunderstood or contested. It was not a son of Joseph, but the Son of God who was born of a sinful woman, under law, in the likeness of sinful flesh, of the seed of David according to the flesh—and David's "flesh" was full of sin. The seed of David was flesh, the woman that bare the Son of God was of this seed, of sinful flesh, and the Son of God himself was of the same sinful flesh and sinful seed, "born under law", i.e., subject to law because of sin, and living in the likeness of flesh of sin. This "likeness" was so complete that not only Jesus, but Christ himself must die because of his "flesh", for Paul's cardinal doctrine was that flesh is sinful and must die. Paul knows of no redemption of the "flesh", but only of "deliverance" from it. The idea of a Virgin-birth is unknown to Paul, nor could there be a place for it in his Christology.

This Christ, born of the seed of David, "is the image of the invisible God, the Firstborn of all creation"(Col 1:15), and consequently pre-existent. But because he had come into sinful flesh, he had to die.

And Christ was not only born of a woman, it was Christ, too, that had to be and was circumcised(Col 2:11), apparently because he was "under law". Men had to be circumcised in the "flesh", because "flesh" was sinful and must die, and not only Jesus but Christ, the eternal, pre-existent Christ and Son of God, was a partaker of this sinful flesh. This is Paul's "mystery of Christ"(Eph 3:4; Col 4:3)—and it still remains a mystery. Paul claimed a special revelation for it (Eph 3:3). It is said to have come to him during the last years of his life,

but even at that it does not lessen the chasm between his Gospel and the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. In this Christology Jesus was so completely submerged under Christ, that Paul's Christ was not only the seed of David but had also to be circumcised as sinful flesh. Paul was able to create a religion, so completely divorced from the religion of Jesus, that a new name, "Christian", had to be found for it, and he and his followers were able to substitute it for the religion of Jesus. Some scholars have called Paul "the second founder" of Christianity. That is a grave mistake. He was the founder of it, for Jesus founded neither the Church nor Christianity, but proclaimed the Kingdom of the Heavens.

Alexandrian Christology.

There was also an Alexandrian party, represented in Apostolic times by Apollos, a learned and zealous disciple, Jew by race, and born in Alexandria (Acts 18:24). The epistle to the Hebrews and the prologue to John's Gospel represent the views of this party. The present writer holds, with Luther and a number of modern scholars, that Apollos was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, because his home was at Alexandria, he probably knew Philo or was at least acquainted with his writings and philosophy, and he was a well educated man. The Epistle to the Hebrews is written in excellent Greek, far ahead in language and style of any other book of the New Testament. Tradition has it, that Apollos was one of The Seventy, and among New Testament men he is the logical and by far the best fitted man to have written this book. Its theology and language differs in many respects radically from that of Paul, to whom some ascribe the authorship of this epistle, which in its teaching sometimes agrees with that of Paul, sometimes with that of Mark, and oftener with the Johannine writings.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has a distinct message to us, bearing upon the person of Jesus. It was written some time before the fall of Jerusalem, 70 A.D. Its author knew of a "new and living Way" (Hb 10:20), that is, a new doctrine that

could give eternal life to man. This "way" had been laid by Jesus and was far superior to the "teaching" or system of doctrines dealing with "baptisms"—there were several kinds of baptisms among the disciples at that time—"and laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment"(Hb 6:2), for such things belong to the rudiments of faith(Hb 5:12).

The author prefers to use the name Jesus, though he uses the name Christ just as often, and rarely the term Jesus Christ.

He calls Jesus the Son of God (Hb 4:14), who is our highpriest. And he is highpriest not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchizedek, who was "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, and abides for ever"(Hb 7:3). As the Son of God Jesus has neither an earthly father nor an earthly mother. This "Son has God appointed heir of all things"(Hb 1:2), and "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son; and again, when he brings in the Firstborn among the inhabitants of the earth, he says, And let all the angels of God worship him"(Hb 1:50-6).

But Jesus was also a perfectly human being, of the tribe of Judah(Hb 7:14), "who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him out of the death, and having been heard for his piety, though he was Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him a cause of eternal salvation"(Hb 5:7-9). According to this author, Jesus had not been perfect all the time, while he was in the flesh, but he became perfect through obedience.

Christ has pre-existed, for the Israelites "accounted the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt"(Hb 11:26), and Christ came as a highpriest of "the good things to come"(Hb 9:11). "The blood of Christ who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without blemish

unto God, shall cleanse our conscience from dead works to serve the living God"(Hb 9:14).

This sounds very much like Pauline teaching, and Apollos was for a time associated with Paul, but in other passages he makes it clear that he refers to Jesus, for it is "by the blood of Jesus"(Hb 10:19) we enter into the Holy Place through the veil which is his "flesh"(Hb 10:20). And it is Jesus who is the "captain and perfecter of faith"(Hb 12:2), "the mediator of the new covenant"(Hb 12:24), "who suffered without the gate"(Hb 13:12), and "became the surety of a better covenant"(Hb 7:22), being "the highpriest after the order of Melchizedek"(Hb 6:20), and "having tasted death for all, a little lower than the angels, he has been crowned with glory and honor"(Hb 2:9).

Apollos represents Jesus as a descendant of the tribe of Judah, the Son of God, and the Christ. It is only in his teaching on the human nature of Jesus, where he has really fallen below the Johannine mark.

Petrine Christology.

The Petrine view is represented by some speeches of Peter, recorded in the Book of Acts. Peter some times is called a "pillar" and in a late source used in Matthew's gospel even is represented as the *Rock*, on which Christ was to build his Assembly and although Peter is constantly named the first of *The Twelve*, he was at times vacillating in character, yielding now in one direction, now in another, as circumstances were pressing him.

It is indeed unfortunate that we have no writings preserved from the hand of Peter, save parts of a few speeches recorded in the Book of Acts (1:15-22; 2:14-39; 3:6, 12-26; 4:8-12, 19-29; 5:3-4, 8-9, 29-32; 8:20-23; 10:34-43; 11:5-17; 15:7-11). Nor can these fragments be regarded as exact reproductions of his speeches, but rather as short resumés of them, reflecting the views of the author who wrote them, and perhaps colored by Luke when he incorporated them into his history of the Apostles.

But though these references are scanty and not of first hand value, they still may represent the life and views of the primitive Brotherhood in Jerusalem. For in regard to the person of Jesus these "speeches" present a picture which in its main features reminds strongly of that presented by the Gospel of Mark and the Logia of Matthew.

The common form for reference to Jesus is "Lord Jesus" (Acts 1:21; 4:33; 7:59; 8:16; 15:26), though mostly he is mentioned simply as "Jesus", and a few times as "Jesus Christ" (2:38; 3:20; 5:42; 8:12, 37; 9:34; 10:36), and "Jesus Christ, the Nazarene" (3:6; 4:10), which may be an expansion of "Jesus of Nazareth" (10:38), or "Jesus the Nazarene" (2:22; 6:14).

Jesus is called the "Son of God" (3:13), and again it is said that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (8:37). Still more important is the fact that Jesus is referred to as "thy holy child" (4:27, 30), though another interpretation, "thy holy servant", is not only possible, but probably even more correct. For it is said that this "holy servant" was "anointed" (4:30), and this anointing took place after the baptism, when "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth" (10:38).

But Peter regarded Jesus also as "the fruit of the loins" of David (2:30), who was to sit upon the throne of David, and he explained this as the fulfillment of a prophecy on the resurrection of the Christ (2:31), and "that his flesh should not see corruption."

Peter's message, therefore, was this:

1. The flesh of Jesus was corruptible, but was saved from corruption through the resurrection. Jesus was a descendant of David, "the fruit of his loins." He was therefore a common human being, known as Jesus of Nazareth, or Jesus the Nazarene.

2. This Jesus was the Son of God, and had, most probably, been so from childhood.

3. This Son of God had been "anointed" by God after he had been baptized by John, and he became then the Christ.

It was the anointed Jesus who suffered upon the cross (3:

18), and rose again, to sit at the right hand of the Father, though he was still present upon earth, healing the sick through the apostles (3:26).

Peter's picture of Jesus is so thoroughly human, with all its heavenly splendor, that we cannot but recognize it and pronounce it perfectly genuine. What a contrast it makes to that of Paul's Christ!

Markan Christology.

Mark, whose Gospel became the foundation of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, does not once represent Jesus as claiming that he was the Son of God, though the evangelist implies that he was so, and introduces other agencies to declare it. The addition of "the Son of God" in the superscription to Mark's Gospel, "The Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ", does not occur in the earliest manuscripts and was added in the fifth or sixth century. Mark's Gospel deals only with the history of the latter part of the ministry of Jesus Christ. So do the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, in so far as they are dependent upon Mark.

Mark's picture of Jesus presents an exalted, noble-minded gentleman, attractive and winning in his ways and still majestic, intrepid and forceful, magnanimous though never deviating from the path of justice, who knew what he wanted and willed what was best. Though Mark presents Jesus as a man of prayer, tender to the outcasts, fearless before his antagonists, of powerful speech, witty, and logical in his thoughts, inexhaustible and resourceful in expression and work, still Mark never loses sight of this, that his hero is Jesus of Nazareth, a genuinely human being who had been made perfect in thoughts and words and conduct, measuring up to and even reaching above any standard of man that mind and philosophy might wish to set.

There is nothing specifically Jewish in the Markan picture of Jesus. Though devoted to his own country and people, the Master's conversation and bearing is so intensively universal that he appears rather a cosmopolitan than a Jew of petty Pa-

lestine, a teacher of the learned, Grecian world rather than a citizen of the giant empire of Rome. Mark may have had in mind and view to present Jesus to the world of Greek intelligence, but if he meant that, he does not betray it. His delineations of the Master are drawn with exquisite delicacy, and the characteristics of his behaviours and aims so faithful to nature and divine design, that almost in every sentence we meet with Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Man, ready to meet sons of men of every race and tongue and land.

But though Mark's Jesus of Nazareth is all human in manners, words, and work, he is so only, because within him is a force of personality that has its mainspring fastened in the heart of the Father and his eye set upon the Kingdom of God in such a way that he must belong to that Kingdom by birth-right. He was ready, perfected, before he started on his career, and conscious of purpose and aim before he sent forth his first call to a sullen world for sharing citizenship with him in the Kingdom of God. Mark would probably never have understood this call nor heeded it, nor introduced his Jesus of Nazareth to the world, had not God himself come and introduced this Jesus as his own Son in whom he was well pleased.

What could Mark do but spread the Gospel about that divine recognition and introduce Jesus of Nazareth to the world? "Straightway"—which is the characteristic catch-word of Mark—he found the key to Jesus' personality. That Master of his could not be anything else than he was, and could not say or do anything else than he did, because the voice from heaven had announced that this was his beloved Son. Mark had seen this Son of God, had heard him, had touched him, a real human being of flesh and blood; he had heard his mother and Peter and others speak of this wonderful man. And "wonderful" was that man; but however much Mark looked at him, in daylight or dreaming, he was ever the same, and ever his Jesus of Nazareth. Though impulsive and enthusiastic, Mark needed but to see him in order to understand him and to grasp that personality. Then, with extraordinary common sense he began to describe this life and explain to the world that Jesus

of Nazareth was a perfect human being, and was so, because he was a Son of God. Then he reversed his way of expression and implied that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, and therefore infinitely more than an ideal man, whom he and every body else could not help but love and admire. He did not need to prove that he was the Son of God, for he was so, because he was the ideal of humanity.

The divine declaration, that Jesus was the Son of God, came after the baptism of John, a baptism that meant "change of mind" and expectation of the Kingdom. Washed in the pure waters of Jordan, with John's blessing resting upon his head, and minded to heed the call for the Kingdom, the Master, as he was stepping out of the water, heard the heavenly voice say, "Thou art my beloved Son." What was he to do? What could he do? Thousands of sons of God had been upon the earth before that hour, and thousands of sons of God, angels and men, were there now, all waiting, as John and Jesus and the multitude, for "the Kingdom to come." Could Jesus of Nazareth bring it to man, because he was not only a son of God, but The Son of God? No! Not, because of that fact alone. He must be the Messiah, "anointed", and endowed with "power and authority" by Holy Spirit for that purpose. But he was as yet not the Messiah, the Christ, promised to the faithful since "days of old." He must be something more than perfect man and the Son of God in order to bring the Kingdom to man. Apparently he was longing for power and authority to do it, waiting and praying, as he was stepping up to the shore. Could he become the Messiah? Could he fill that measure? He knew that he was of the seed of David. He had just heard that he was the Son of God, a fact that he knew before, had ever known it. But he had heard it now, that this sonship was unclouded, and heard it from his own Father. All the prerequisites but the anointing were there for Messiah.

"Straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder and The Spirit as a dove descending upon him"(Mk 1: 10). The Messiah had come and the impulse for a ministry of healing, preaching, teaching, and serving had

been imparted with this "anointing" by The Spirit, and was operating within him with a power and an authority which no one else has ever possessed or exercised.

Mark's Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God and became the Messiah after his baptism, not because of it. Now he could begin his ministry, (and began it), of bringing the Kingdom to man. From that moment until his death Jesus remained to Mark the same human, gentle, manly Jesus of Nazareth. After the resurrection Mark's pencil is no longer able to trace the radiant features of the risen Son of Man. Nor can these features any more be traced by hand, but must be delineated upon the heart of man by the Son of Man himself. And when that story is written upon the human mind and a shadow of the Son of Man falls on the trembling heart of man, then this man, too, is a son of God and the "Kingdom has come."

Such is the Gospel of Mark.

Johannine Christology.

The Johannine view is represented by the Gospel and the First Epistle of John and the Book of Revelation. John was the "Elder" of Ephesus. Devoted disciples gathered around him, all imbued with the "Johannine" principles, and the twenty-first chapter of his Gospel as well as some of the visions of the Apocalypse may well have been written by some one of this group. The Johannine testimony, though partly written toward the end of the first century, bears all the characteristic marks of an eyewitness, and is therefore of utmost importance for the understanding of the religion which Jesus of Nazareth preached, taught, and delivered, publicly and in his mysteries.

John wrote his Gospel for the purpose "that ye may believe that Jesus is the anointed, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (Jh 20:31). This is clear enough for any man to understand. Jesus was both the anointed, or Christ, and the Son of God. He does not say when he became either the anointed or the Son of God, nor if he became such at one and the same time, or on different occasions.

In a certain passage John tells a story about Philip who "finds Nathanael and says to him, We have found him of whom Moses wrote in the Law and the prophets, Jesus, son of Joseph, he from Nazareth"(Jh 1:45). This event happened after the baptism. He is describing in this passage both the son of Joseph and the "one of whom Moses wrote in the Law", which can only mean Messiah. For on the day before Andrew used the title Messiah, when he spoke of Jesus to his brother Simon. It was Andrew who found Philip, and it was Philip who found Nathanael. This happened during the two days following the baptism. It is natural to assume that they all meant that "Jesus, son of Joseph", was Messiah. Andrew had a companion who is not mentioned by name. Modesty alone forbade the author of this Gospel to mention his own name at this occasion. But there is no doubt that "the other disciple" was John himself. He heard when they all spoke of Jesus as the son of Joseph, even if he did not know that fact before. He believed that it was so. There can be no question of that fact. In the mind and conviction of John, Jesus was the son of Joseph of Nazareth.

But John believed also that Jesus was the Son of God, and the Messiah, or Christ. This is confirmed by a statement of the Jews, "And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how does he now say, I am come down out of the heaven"(Jh 6:42)? To the Jews Jesus was the son of Joseph who is referred to as still alive. Jesus did not deny this, though he asserted that God, too, was his Father.

The Jews expected Christ to be a human being, of the seed of David. "Has not the Scripture said that Christ comes of the seed of David, from Bethlehem, the village where David was"(Jh 7:42)?

CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIRTH OF JESUS. Jesus was born during the lifetime of Herod the Great (Mt 2:1). This king died shortly before Passover, year 4 B.C.

That night when Jesus was born "shepherds were keeping watch by night in the field over their flock"(Lk 2:8). This

must have happened during the warm season, and on that account before year 4, B.C.

There was an "enrolment" or census of the people by tribes at the time when Jesus was born. Such an enrolment was held in Egypt in year 8 B.C., but it is probable that it took place some years later in Palestine.

At the time of the birth of Jesus, Quirinius was raising an army in Syria for the war against the Homonadenses in Cilicia. This war cannot be dated earlier than year 4, nor later than year 2 B.C. Year 5 B.C. would therefore seem most likely to be the birthyear of Jesus.

For the exact day of the year, the *dies natalis* of Jesus, we have no other data than those furnished by the followers of Basilides, who celebrated the birthday of Jesus on May 20, the feast of the Niloa. This people claimed that Jesus was born on the very day when the Egyptians celebrated the Heavenly Descent of the Nile." This sacrosanct feast was celebrated on the 25th day of the Egyptian month Pachon, which corresponds to May 20. There is no valid reason to doubt this tradition. Basilides wrote his treatise on religion at the beginning of the second century. He believed in Jesus as the Saviour, and the birthday of Jesus was of extreme importance in his astrological system of religion. At this early date it was still possible to establish the exact date of the Nativity. We hold therefore that Jesus was born on May 20, year 5 B.C.

Counting forty weeks for pregnancy, the Annunciation took place on August 13, year 6 B.C.

On the basis of these dates we can establish the dates of the visit of the angel to Zacharias and the birth of John the Baptist with tolerable certainty.

The visit of the angel to Zacharias took place some time before that to Mary, and since Elizabeth "hid herself five months" (Lk 1:24) before Mary's visit to her, at least that space of time must have lapsed between the two visits of the angel.

It is true that Luke states, that "in the sixth month" (Lk 1:26) the angel was sent to Mary. This must, however, not be construed to mean that fully six months had passed by between the two visits. The author of this source must have belonged to the old tribe of Levi, because he reckoned the months by number, as the Levites also did, not by names. "Sixth month" means the same as month Elul, which was the Aaronic name of this month. The visit took place on one of the twenty-nine days of Elul, for that was the length of this month.

Zacharias belonged to the "Course" of Abijah (Lk 1:5).

There were twenty-four "courses" of priests serving in turn in the Temple of Jerusalem (1 Chr 24:7-18), each course serving one week at the time, and twenty-four weeks and courses marked a cycle. The first course was that of Jehoiarib, and the eight that of Abijah, the order being: 1, Jehoiarib; 2, Jedaiah; 3, Harim; 4, Seorim; 5, Malchijah; 6, Mijamin; 7, Hakkoz; 8, Abijah; 9, Jeshna; 10, Shecaniah; 11, Eliashib; 12, Jakim; 13, Huppah; 14, Jeshebab; 15, Bilgah; 16, Immer; 17, Hezir; 18, Happizez; 19, Pethahiah; 20, Jehezkiel; 21, Jachin; 22, Gamul; 23, Delaiah; 24, Maaziah.

The daily sacrifices ceased in the Temple on July 17, year 70 A.D. On that day the course of Jehoiarib should have entered into service. This day marked therefore the beginning of a new cycle.

Counting 159 cycles, or 3816 courses and weeks back from July 17, year 70 A.D., we reach June 30, year 6 B.C. On that day a new cycle was begun, the course of Jehoiarib entering on service.

If we count seventeen weeks back from June 30, we come to March 3, year 6 B.C., when Zacharias and the course of Abijah entered on service in the Temple. March 3, year 6 B.C. should then be the day of the angel's visit to Zacharias.

Assuming again forty weeks for pregnancy, John the Baptist was born on or about December 8, in the year 6 B.C.

The first day of Elul, "the sixth month", fell that year on August 9, and about five months and five days had passed by between the two visits of the angel.

These data furnish us with the following chronology of the birth of Jesus:

Year 6 B.C., March 3, the visit of the angel to Zacharias.

Year 6 B.C., August 13, the date of the Annunciation.

Year 6 B.C., December 8, date of the birth of John the Baptist.

Year 5 B.C., May 20, date of the birth of Jesus.

GABRIEL means "Man of God", from gabr, "man" and el, "God." He is mentioned in Lk 1:19, 26, and in Dn 8:16; 9:21. According to the Book of Enoch Gabriel is an archangel, the divine herald, who corresponds to the Hermes of the Greeks, the Mercury of the Romans, the Odin of Nordic sagas, the Nabu of the Babylonians, Thoth of the Egyptians, and Mithras of the Persians. He was the messenger sent to Daniel at two special occasions, always on divine errands. Hermes, the messenger of the

Greek gods, was one of the **Cabeiri**, the great divinities that founded the celebrated Samothracian mysteries. This name is the Greek rendering of the ancient Aramaic **gabir**, which corresponds to Hebrew **gibor**, "demigod", not "giant" as AV renders it, nor "mighty man" as in RV. We read of these "demigods" in Gn 6:4, "The Sons of the Gods went in unto the daughters of the Man, and they brought forth (children) to them; these were the demigods (**giborim**) which in ancient time were the **Anse** of that name." In Gn 6:2 it is said that "The Sons of the Gods saw the daughters of the Man, that they were beautiful; and they took for themselves wives among all, whom they chose." These "sons of the gods", though spiritual beings, and equal to the stars (Jb 1:6; 2:1; Ps 29:1; 89:7), are the same as the spiritual "man" whose creation is described in Gn 1:27. That "man" was a "son of the gods", but he was at the same time a real man, "the strong man", and that is the meaning of **gabir**. They are therefore both gods and men, "god-men." Since they married the "daughters of the Man" or Adam, perfectly human beings, who lived in the "Man-Land" or Adamah, north of Idumea, we may presume that these "god-men" or "sons of the gods" lived somewhere nearby. In the early Egyptian inscriptions the country around Kadesh Barnea is called "God's Land", though the same people, referred to in later inscriptions, are living in the land of Punt or Somali land of Africa. They had apparently migrated thither.

It is natural to suppose that the "sons of the gods" lived in the "Land of the gods", and that they had descendants who were called "demigods" or **Anse**, "god-sons" or "god-men." From the Hebrew viewpoint these gods and demigods would be called "angels", that is, beings standing midway between God and man.

Hermes, the divine messenger, is also called "the great **Cabeiro**." This god had come to Greece together with **Cadmos**, "the man from Kadem", or "the East-land", and this was the name of the old home of the Aramic race, which was at a later time called Syria. Sometimes **Cadmos** and **Cabeiro** denote the same identity.

Undoubtedly there is a relationship between the ideas underlying **Cabeiro**, **Gabri-el**, and the semi-divine **giborim**, reflecting an age when gods and men were living together upon earth.

JOSEPH, the father of Jesus, was a descendant of the royal line of David and of the tribe of Judah. He was betrothed to Mary. He was probably older than Mary, but there is no evidence whatever that he had been married before, or that he had

children with another wife. The brothers and sisters of Jesus, mentioned in Mt 13:55, were children of Joseph and Mary, all ecclesiastical dogmas to the contrary. The evidence of the Gospels on this point is overwhelming and uniform. Joseph was dead before Jesus began his ministry, at any rate before the crucifixion.

The Sinaitic Palimpsest reads (Mt 1:16): "and Joseph ... begat Jesus, who is called the Christ", while other manuscripts equally old, or older, read, "Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Christ." Some Ebionites held a similar view, namely that Joseph was the real father of Jesus.

Joseph had the same name as Jacob's first son by Rachel. This story, told in Gn 37-50, is composed of two different stories, each dealing with a Joseph of its own and belonging to different epochs:

Joseph*, son of Jacob, came to Egypt about 1906 B.C. and became vizier of Egypt under Sesostri III in 1885 B.C. His father and family settled in Goshen. This Joseph cut loose from the kings of the twelfth dynasty, founded the Hyksos dynasty of Egypt, and assumed the throne name of Salatis. He was succeeded by his brother Bnon, or Benoni, the Biblical Benjamin.

Joseph**, son of Israel, came to Egypt about 1200 B.C. and ruled Egypt during the interval between the nineteenth and twentieth dynasties. According to Manetho and Josephus he assumed in Egypt the name Osar-siph. His people were settled in the land of Ramses. Ramses III subdued them and became their oppressor. During the reign of Ramses IV they went out of Egypt under the leadership of Osar-ship, who now assumed the name Moseh, "Deliverer."

At the compilation of the Book of Genesis the two stories were joined into one.

BETROTHED was a virgin or a widow, when her purchase money (Heb. *mohar*, Ass. *tirchatu*) had been paid to her parents, or to her legal protector—if her parents were dead—or sometimes even to herself. She was from that time her purchaser's property, because he had paid for her in legal tender, either in money, or property, or by work, as Jacob did. If money was paid, fifty silver shekels (about \$20.00) was the average price (Dt 22:29). More often cattle was offered in exchange. In Homeric Greece the betrothed virgins are called "oxen-bringers." Jacob served seven years for each of his two wives. A concubine was cheaper.

When the purchase price had been paid, the betrothed damsel was forbidden to associate with other men. She was now a mere piece of chattel. The nuptials followed when the bride was brought to the bridegroom's house, but she was his, and he could treat her as he pleased, as soon as the betrothal was performed. Sometimes a wife was allowed a good deal of freedom, but that all depended upon her husband's whims.

In earliest Biblical times, in the days of the matriarchate, marriage was denoted by the phrase "go in unto", which originally was said of a man entering a woman's tent, but later on came to mean "taking up of marital relations." At that time inheritance came through the mother, and she gave names to her children. Thus Eve gave names to Cain and Abel (Gn 4:1).

When ancient society changed from the matriarchate to the patriarchate, the young man went on a predatory expedition to get a wife, whom he "took" and she became his chattel. Marriage is now called "taking a wife", though this phrase literally means "seizing a woman." Since the man no longer has a clan, as in the days of the matriarchate, to defend himself, he takes, or "seizes" as many "women" as he can support, for his instinct of selfpreservation now impells him to build up a clan of his own to protect him. The child is therefore called **ben** or **bath**, "son" or "daughter", literally "built up", because the father builds his family. Polyandry passed thus into polygamy, which was the social custom in Palestine in the days of the Master. The gospels do not contain a single word from the lips of the Master, condemning polygamy. He recognized marriage merely as a legal institution, for "in the Kingdom men do not take wives, nor are women given to men in marriage: because they have become as the angels of God" (Mk 12:15). His interest was centered in man as a citizen of the Kingdom.

When the Hebrews changed from nomadic to agricultural and more settled life, the marriage could no longer be a robbery, and was therefore consummated through a purchase of the bride. Still, the formula for "marrying" remained as before, though "taking a woman" now came to mean "bringing a woman" to the purchaser's house. This required a betrothal, although the betrothal was often performed without the maiden's consent, sometimes even without her knowledge.

We have no evidence under what condition Joseph and Mary were betrothed, or to whom Joseph paid the **mohar** for his bride. But we know that she was then his property, and infidelity on her part would cost her life, if she were detected. (Dt 22: 23-29).

Virgin is a young, marriageable woman. The Greek word used in Lk 1:27 is *parthenos*, corresponding to Heb. *betulah*, one who possesses "the tokens of virginity" (Dt 22:14-15).

In the famous passage of Isaiah, "Behold, the maiden shall be with child, and shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel" (Is 7:14), the word for "maiden" is *almah*, "one capable of nourishing a child." The Greek text renders "maiden" with "virgin" in this passage.

PARTHENOGENESIS, "virgin-birth", is not unknown to science. It is a well-known fact and absolutely certain, that parthenogenesis takes place all the time in the lower forms of animal life. Cases of parthenogenesis have also been reported among human beings.

Furthermore, there are numerous ancient myths, telling how pure women became pregnant by the approach of some divinity, and such cases were explained, not as carnal conceptions, but as the result of highly spiritual experiences. The learned Greeks took pains to explain Zeus' numerous amours, not as carnal unions, but as manifestations of the deity to persons moving in ecstatic rapture. Ancient kings and emperors, notably of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria, claimed themselves to be the sons of the gods. Other favored persons, too, made similar claims. People believed it wholly, and regarded such cases as evidence of special divine favors. Antiquity was filled with this belief, and in view of modern experiences in various fields of science, we have no right to discredit all these tales.

Modern science has advanced several theories for explaining parthenogenesis. One of these theories suggests that a spermatozoon or male gamete may have become part of an embryo, that is, have been transferred to a fertilized ovum without entering the nucleus of it, to have remained undeveloped for some time, and then, under favorable conditions, to have been started on toward independent life through union with some cell that contained ingredients peculiar to the ovum. Since such conditions exist among the lower animals, it cannot be categorically denied that the same procedure is impossible among the higher animals, and even among men.

Another theory of parthenogenesis, which concerns only females, is that the ovum always has the power of development without fertilization, if "subjected to an altered environment."|* An ecstatic condition is certainly "an altered environment."

The possibility of an immaculate conception cannot on

*| L. Cuénot, *Bull. Sci. France et Belgique*, XXXII, 1899, pp. 426-535.

scientific grounds be set aside as unworthy of consideration. The case of *semper virgo*, "perpetual virginity", however, is another thing, a silly dogma and nothing else.

MARIAM is the correct pronunciation of the name of the mother of Jesus. Our name Mary comes from the Latin form Maria. Mariam was also the name of the sister of Moses and Aaron, though the Massoretes pointed the letters to read Miriam.

Miriam, the sister of Moses, was born in Egypt, and her name was Egyptian, as were the names of her two brothers, Moses and Aaron. Miriam, or Mariam, is abbreviated from the Egyptian Mari-Amon, "Beloved-by-Amon", or "Amon-Loves". Amon was the chief divinity of Egypt during the eighteenth dynasty, the time of Moses, and his temple was the great temple of Karnak, at Thebes, of Upper Egypt. Miriam was a prophetess (Ex 15:20), and claimed that Jahveh spoke also through her (Nu 12:1). After the passage through the Red Sea she sang a song in honor of Jahveh (Ex 15:16). In spite of this, it seems probable that she had become a prophetess, while she lived in Egypt, and had began her services as a prophetess of Amon. The feud between her and Moses, in which she was supported by her brother Aaron, who was a worshipper of Hathor, the divine cow, with a temple at Horeb—this feud was in all probability of much greater seriousness than the present text of Nu 12:1-15 seems to indicate. It was not a feud merely between two persons, but between two religions, the worship of Jahveh or Amon, and Jahveh himself had to enter the battlefield in order to help Moses carry off the victory. Miriam lost the fight and was punished with leprosy, of which she was healed through the intercession of Moses, although she must stay outside the camp for seven days, until she was healed. But so great was the veneration of the people for her, that they refused to march or move camp until Miriam was restored unto them.

By the story of leprosy Miriam is tacitly connected with the "Lepers" or Hyksos people, described by the Egyptian historian Manetho as well as by the Jewish historian Josephus. Among ancient people Egypt was regarded as the home-land of leprosy, through the Egyptians blamed the Hyksos for the introduction of leprosy into their country. This mean skin-disease, *elephantiasis*, was a frequent plague of the Jews in the days of the Master.

Miriam was a prophetess who sang praises to Jahveh. Mariam, the mother of Jesus, was a prophetess in the same sense, for she sang the sublime *Magnificat*, "My soul does magnify the

Lord", which has become the world's greatest panygyric of him "who was, and is, and ever shall be."

From the historical viewpoint it is a remarkable coincidence that the mother of Jesus had the same name as the first prophetess of Jahveh, the sister of the "Deliverer." Equally remarkable is the fact that this name is not Semitic, but Egyptian. In the light of divine government, in the policy of the Kingdom, we should expect that history would thus repeat itself in important events like this. Miriam was of Hyksos blood, and Mary was from Bethlehem-Ephrathah, that is, of non-Semitic descent. Both of them lived for a time in Egypt and were partakers of Egyptian culture; both left Egypt to go to the land of "promises", and both were prophetesses who sang "Praises" to the Lord.

NAZARETH was a town in Galilee, in the plain of Ezdraelon, midway between the Mediterranean and the lake of Genesareth. It is situated on the side of a hill, facing the east, in a basin entirely shut in by hills except toward the south. Nazareth is not mentioned in the Old Testament, by Josephus, or in the Talmud. In ancient times it must have been a little, insignificant place (Jh 1:46), but was raised to some prominence by the Crusaders, was treated severely by the Moslems, became somewhat important during the nineteenth century, and has now more than 10,000 inhabitants. Its modern name is *en-Nazira*. Ephiphanius claims that up to the time of Constantine, Nazareth had none but Jewish inhabitants, which might help to explain the bitter hatred which they showed to Jesus and his followers. But Ephiphanius is an unreliable guide.

In the Gospels Nazareth is mentioned as the residence of Joseph and Mary, and as the "fatherland" of Jesus, who resided there until shortly after his baptism. He is therefore repeatedly called "Jesus of Nazareth" (Mt 21:11; 26:71; Mk 1:24; 10:47; 14:67; 16:6; Lk 4:34; 18:37; 24:19; Jh 1:45; 18:5,7; 19:19; Acts 2:22; 3:6; 4:10; 6:14; 10:38; 22:8; 26:9). Since Nazareth is not mentioned in the Old Testament, some scholars have argued that this name is a denotation for Galilee, and that Beth-lehem of Galilee was Jesus' birthplace, where he and his parents lived, but which an early Christian tradition came to identify with Bethlehem-Ephrathah of Judea. There is no foundation for such theories. There was and is a city of Nazareth, which is never called the birthplace of Jesus, because of the fact that he was not born there. That it is once called his "fatherland" (*patris*) is correct, because it was the place where his father Joseph lived.

CHAPTER IV.

The Virgin-Birth.

All Gospel sources agree that Mary was the mother of Jesus, that is, the mother of that human being who is known as Jesus of Nazareth.

We have already seen that Jesus of Nazareth was regarded as a son of God, and therefore was a perfect man. We have also learned that he was held to be The Son of God, and the Messiah. If Mary was the mother of Jesus of Nazareth, does that mean that she was also the mother of The Son of God and of the Messiah?

Motherhood presupposes two distinct acts, conception and birth. If she were the mother of The Son of God, or of the Messiah, or of both, she must have conceived and born them.

If we mean with the Son of God a distinct being dwelling in Jesus of Nazareth, then we must postulate a separate conception and birth of The Son of God. If, on the other hand, the Son of God denotes a special quality in the being of Jesus of Nazareth, a certain, say, divine attribute inherent in the make-up of the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, then there can be no question of the conception and birth of the Son of God. In this case Jesus differs only in attributes, not in nature, from any other human being, and he has only one nature and one personality.

The same reasoning and arguments apply to the Messiah.

Again it is asked, Who was the father of Jesus? Our answer is: if Jesus were a mere human being, then he had a human father, who presumably was Joseph, the husband of Mary. If Jesus was a son of God, then he must have had a son of God for his father, whether that son of God was an angel or a perfect, sinless man. If Jesus was The Son of God,

the Firstborn, the Only-begotten, then he must have God himself for his Father.

The solution of these problems must be found in the Gospels and be given by eyewitnesses who had known Jesus and had learned from him, or from those near him, what they testified upon this all-important question.

The "life of Jesus", as presented in the Gospels, is so different from any other biography, that it must be studied by itself. A comparison with other life histories will fail to give us a clear insight into the life of Jesus. In spite of modern demands to the contrary, and notwithstanding modern dislike of the supernatural, the life of Jesus must be studied by itself, because it has no analogies in modern experience. Numerous solutions have been offered, but none so convincing that it can change this verdict.

Just now it is too late to try to deny the existence either of the supernatural or of more than one ego in man.

If the supernatural, the miracles and the signs are removed from the Gospels, nothing but a faint shadow, something of a ghost, remains. The life of Jesus is so innately interwoven with the supernatural, that a denial of it leaves nothing but shreds of either.

Nor is there room, at the present stage of science, to deny the verity and existence of the supernatural. The further science progresses, the more we are made aware, how the supernatural and the miraculous are closing in upon us. We are just beginning to realize that man even now, in his daily life, is living a large part of his life within the unseen and supernatural. Psychic phenomena are no longer mere phantasies or imaginations. An unseen world surrounds us, animates us and our surroundings, and takes hold of us, of our doings, and of the events of the day in a manner that makes man feel his insignificance, in all his greatness, as he never before has felt.

Science has made and is making rapid strides forward and enters daily new fields. But its progress is limited, and sharply so. We know that we have perceptions, we make use of them, and we know that they are conveyed over an intricate system

of nerves—we know a good deal about that—but we do as yet not know how we perceive, and still this seems so simple to us. Just now it looks as if we will never learn this secret, except through some assistance from the world beyond matter.

Electricity has been discovered and is used in a myriad of ways for the benefit of man, but no one knows what electricity is. What is matter? Science says today that in its ultimate form, the electron, it is immense force. But force is divine—in no case is it a part of matter.

We see, but we do not know how mind gets hold of the picture that appears on the retina and is conveyed by the optical nerve to the brain. We do not even know what force it is that places such a picture on the retina. What shall we then say of second sight, telepathy, and clairvoyance?

We know very little of what the qualities of smell, clang, and taste in an object consist, though most of us are able to smell, hear and taste, and many know the laws of the senses that convey such impressions.

What is life? Science is as yet not able to answer this question, nor is it able to inform us what death is. And still, all these questions seem so simple! A large number of theories have been offered us on these and similar subjects as solutions of these enigmata of life, but these theories are constantly being modified, replaced, and “found wanting.”

The present time is ill adapted for denying the existence of the supernatural or its hold upon the currents of life.

In regard to the nature of man, science has been able to affirm, that two egos are operating within man, and that one of these egos is supraliminal. Since this can be verified in man, there is no use to deny the existence of two natures in Jesus of Nazareth. To deny categorically a supernatural birth of Jesus, is not warranted from the point of view of science, if such a birth can be supported by historical evidence. All that we can do is to listen to what trustworthy eyewitness have to say upon this subject, and then try to explain the facts in the light of the results of modern science.

The Message of Paul.

We have already presented the main features of Paul's Christology upon this subject. Paul regarded Jesus Christ as born of "sinful flesh." "Him who knew of no sin he made (to be) sin on our behalf"(2 Cor 5:21). According to this Christology Joseph, or some other human being, must have been the father of Jesus. The birth of Jesus was, however, a question that did not interest Paul.

The Message of Apollos.

The Epistle to the Hebrews sees in Jesus a being like Melchisedek, a son of God, who had to be perfected. "He was tempted in all, according to likeness, without sin"(Hb 4:15). Accordingly the father of Jesus must have been a son of God, an angel, or a perfect man.

The Markan Message.

The Gospel of Mark is the earliest of the Gospels, but it does not say one word about the conception and birth of Jesus. Still, Mark knew Jesus, because, in all probability, it was at his home that Jesus instituted the Holy Supper, and he was the young man who carried the pitcher of water(Mk 14:13) and guided the disciples to his home. He was "that certain young man"(Mk 14: 51—52) who fled naked away when they tried to arrest him on the way from Gethsemane. Mary, the mother of Mark, knew Jesus well and had been one of his followers. Mark and his mother knew certainly all the facts about the birth of Jesus and Mark would have told us the facts if his history had dealt with that part of the life of Jesus. But Mark began his Gospel with the ministry of Jesus, and had no occasion to describe any detail of his birth. An argument from silence is not admissible.

But although Mark does not refer directly to Jesus' birth, some statements of his, bearing upon this subject, become therefore the more important.

The people of Nazareth, among whom Jesus was brought up, knew nothing but that Jesus was the son of Joseph and

Mary. "Is not this the builder, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and are not his sisters here among us?" (Mk 6:3) they asked. Joseph was probably dead when these questions were asked. But everybody in Nazareth assumed that Jesus and his brothers had the same father. This fact was never questioned in Nazareth. There was not the slightest suspicion of anything else in his "home" country.

The Problem of the Mother of Jesus.

Mark gives us a vivid picture of Mary, the mother of Jesus, which must be historically true, if anything is true in the Synoptic Gospels, and it is as remarkable as it is true. According to Mark, Mary never understood her son. "His near ones" took him for a maniac, "one beside himself", and she may have been one of "those near him who came to lay hold of him" (Mk 3:21). Shortly after this she and her other sons tried to get him away from the people (Mk 3:31-35), presumably for the same reason. On this occasion Jesus placed her far behind his followers, almost repudiating her. She did not follow her son during his ministry (Lk 8:2-3). According to the Synoptists she was not present at the cross (Mk 14:40-41; Mt 27:55-56) because if she had been there, her name would certainly have been mentioned by the Evangelists. Nor was she present at the burial (Mk 15:47), and so far as we know from the Gospels, she did not meet Jesus after the resurrection. Is it psychologically possible, in the face of these facts, to assume that she knew that Jesus was The Son of God? Would she not at some time during his life on earth have understood him? Her conduct in the Temple becomes thus a witness to, that "they did not understand the saying which he spoke to them" (Lk 2:50).

According to the Gospel of John the "mother" of Jesus was present at the cross (Jh 19:25). In this respect the fourth Gospel seems to differ from, if not to contradict the Synoptics. This difference, however, is not so formidable as it appears at first sight. It is to be noticed that the name of "his mother" is not given, as are the names of the other persons who were

present. Modern interpretation is more and more coming to the conclusion that "mother" does not in John's Gospel refer to his earthly mother, but to his spiritual mother, Holy Spirit, dwelling in the spiritual Israel. It was this mother whom Jesus left in care of the Beloved Disciple. It is the Beloved Disciple, and not Peter who never was at the cross, to whom Jesus gave the charge of taking care of "his mother", "the Elect", here on earth. The experience of the Elect bears witness to, that it is only the Johannine spirit which can take care of redeemed souls. This interpretation presupposes a secret teaching of Jesus, not otherwise recorded, which had been given to John, and by which he understood what Jesus meant. The Gospel to the Hebrews records a statement of Jesus, referring to Holy Spirit as the true mother of Jesus.

Jesus felt keenly this estrangement between himself and his mother. "And Jesus said, A prophet is not without honor, save his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house"(Mk 6:4). His family, mother, brothers and sisters included, had joined the people of Nazareth and his relatives in regarding him as a nuisance, half-witted, and a danger to public peace.

This Markan picture of Jesus' mother must be accepted as historically true and must be kept in sight, if we wish to get a true understanding on the conception and birth of Jesus.

What can be the reason for his mother's aversion to him? Some suggestions offer themselves, though nothing definite can be asserted.

1. Did Mary really think that Jesus' mentality was affected, that his mind was not normal? If that was so, was she contributory to it?

2. Did Mary regard the mission of Jesus as a failure? If so, why should she treat him as "beside" himself on that account? Was she entirely void of sympathy for her son, her "firstborn"?

3. Did Mary know of a family secret in connection with the conception of Jesus? Many cases are known where mothers

have turned against their children on that account. Was she disgusted with him because of that?

4. Did Mary not like him, because he did not contribute to the support of the family?

A veil has been drawn tightly over the past, covering up some secrets of the family of Joseph in the little town of Nazareth some nineteen hundred years ago. Some known, and some unknown forces have contributed to bury these secrets securely from the gaze of men. Perhaps it is better so, though it seems as if many features would have become clearer to us of that wonderful man whom millions have loved and myriads still are going to love. We know that both the mother and brothers were converted shortly after the resurrection and became leading members of the Jerusalem Brotherhood. Was it sympathy and love for them that cast this veil over the past of that family? And was it these conversions that brought forth the mystic tales of the visits of angels and spread them guilded abroad at a time when these could no longer be verified by the members of that family?

The Message of Matthew.

Matthew, alone among the Evangelists, has at first sight, a real story of the Virgin-birth: "and he knew her not until she had brought forth a son"(Mt 1:25). But this story is found only in the Gospel of Matthew, and was taken from one of the "doctrinal" documents, written at a very late date. It came to Matthew's Gospel in company with a number of similar "doctrinal" statements found only in Matthew, like the baptismal formula (Mt 28:19), and the introduction of the Church and of the "keys"(Mt 16:18-19). In its present form it presents a late tradition.

This document was apparently of the same class as source II in Luke's story of the Annunciation, and both may complement each other. Luke's source contains a possible hint that the "angel of the Lord" was the ultimate cause of the conception of Jesus.

Matthew begins his story about the conception by saying,

"When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found having (a child) in (the) womb from Holy Spirit"(Mt 1: 8). Joseph planned then privily to put her away, "but while he was meditating on this, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is begotten in her is from Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall heal his people from their sins"(Mt 1:20-21). Matthew then quotes from the Greek version a prophesy from Is 7: 14, that a "virgin" shall conceive and bear a child who shall be called Immanuel. The Hebrew text has "maiden", but the author uses the Greek version which has "virgin", and his story of the Virgin-birth is therefore based upon this faulty translation. Apparently Joseph had gone to sleep, while meditating upon this event: "And Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife"(Mt 1: 24). Then is added, but whether from another source, or by a later redactor, cannot now be decided: "and he knew her not until she had brought forth a son: and he called his name Jesus"(Mt 1:25). The angel has no name in this story, simply "an angel of the Lord", and Joseph regarded Mary "as his wife", when he took her unto him.

The Johannine Message.

In the prologue of the Gospel of John, written in the language and the thought of Philo of Alexandria, probably by John himself—though that is not absolutely certain—occurs the statement, "And the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us: and we saw his glory, a glory as of an Only-begotten from Father, full of grace and truth"(Jh 1:14). This description is quite precise. The glory of the Logos, which became flesh, was of that special kind which is to be found only in an Only-begotten who has been "at the side of" and comes "from the side of" Father. It is also plain that "Father" here means God and nothing else, though "Father" is used instead

of "God", because the author deals with "begetting", and God is represented in this passage as a Father who begets an "Only-begotten."

Logos means "thought", "word." The author wants to say that a special "thought" of the Father has become flesh. This "thought" is therefore divine, a Son of God, or more precisely, The Son of God.

"Logos became flesh." What does our author mean with "flesh?" His language is quite clear on this point. John did not say that Logos became a "body", or that it became "matter" or "substance", terms which the Greek language has excellent facilities to express. No, he said that the Word became "flesh." "Flesh" does not denote substance or molecules, nor the molecules of which meat consists. In the preceding verse "flesh" is contrasted with and placed between "blood" and "man." But "blood" denotes vitality manifested by instincts, and "man" represents "mind" manifested by ego. "Blood" has not a "will" of its own, though it is able to beget. "Man has a "will" of his own and is also able to beget. From 1 John 2: 16 we learn that "flesh" can lust. We are dealing just now with Johannine psychology, the terminology of which has to be grasped before we can expect to understand his psychological terms.

Since a human being can be begotten either by "blood", or by the "will of flesh", or by the "will of man", and since flesh can lust, it is apparent that "flesh" here denotes that *unit of man in which desires and passions have their seat, the unit of animal perception, feeling, and will in man*, which we may simply denote with "animal soul", or "organic soul", that soul which, in conjunction with vitality and substance, constitutes the animal body in man. John's great contribution to human psychology consists in this, that he sees two wills in the human being of man, one an animal or organic will which he calls "the will of the flesh", the other a mental will which he calls "the will of man." John's two human wills corresponds to Plato's idea, in his *Phaedrus*, of two winged "steeds", Desire and Prudence, of which the soul is the charioteer.

As John places "flesh" between "blood" and "man", that is, between instincts and mind, he denotes thereby, that "flesh" signifies the animal or organic soul in man, which can perceive, feel, and will, without having an ego of its own, as mind has. That the divine "Word" became "flesh" means then that a divine thought or word, existing at the side of the Father, descended and condescended to assume the form of an organic or animal soul.

This soul, or "flesh" must have a body of its own, something corresponding to the "spiritual body" (1 Cor 15:44), which "tabernacled" or "dwelt in tent", possessing and manifesting a "glory like that of an Only-begotten from a Father." It is not stated in this passage, which "tent" it was in which the flesh "tabernacled", though we understand from Jh 1:45, that it was "Jesus, son of Joseph, from Nazareth." In this tent, then, existed two forms of "flesh", an organic soul that was begotten by the Father, and another organic soul that was begotten by man, the former being the divine, the latter human.

The Greek word *Skenoo* which John uses to denote "tabernacled" is related to Hebrew *shakan* "to dwell", and to Assyrian *shakan*, "to place", "to make." John alone of New Testament writers uses this word, and he uses it in the specific sense of "tabernacle", as a paraphrase of the Hebrew term *shekinah*, the place of the "presence" of God in the Holy of Holies. As God had a *shekinah* in the Temple, in which he "tabernacled", so the Logos "tabernacled" in the human body of Jesus, son of Joseph, and in like manner God "dwells in all the elect, because "they have been begotten by the will of God" (Jh 1:13). This "will of God" is contrasted to "the will of man" in the preceding verse, and indicates that Jesus had not only a divine, organic soul, but also a divine mental soul or divine ego, as his human being possessed both an organic soul, or consciousness, and a self-conscious soul or mental ego.

We conclude therefore that "flesh", *sarx*, in the Johannine language cannot mean substance, materia, or matter, because

matter has not a will, but denotes the organic soul in man. And this helps us to understand the meaning of several passages in the sixth chapter of John's Gospel, which deal with "eating the flesh of the Son of Man": "The bread that I will give is my flesh" (Jh 6: 51); "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood" (Jh 6: 53); "He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is true meat, and my blood is true drink. He that eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him" (Jh 6: 54-56). In verse 63 of the same chapter "flesh" and "spirit" are placed side by side to denote that "my flesh" was spiritual, while man's flesh, his organic soul, is purely human and "profits nothing."

Paul regarded "flesh" as the matter of which the body was composed (1 Cor 15:50). Sometimes it denotes the body itself (Rom 2: 28). It was therefore nothing but sin, which had to be bruised, destroyed, and put to death (Rom 8: 13). Jesus regarded the body of a disciple as holy, in which he dwelt, even during his life on earth.

Blood is used in these passages to denote "vitality" which manifests itself in the instincts and joins flesh and matter into a living unit. John asserts therefore that there was both a divine and a human vitality in Jesus.

Logos, Jesus and Messiah formed together one identity. Such is the testimony of this eyewitness, who certainly ought to be able to understand this marvel, if any human being is able to understand it. John regarded Jesus as a real human being, the son of Joseph, saw when he was tired, heard him say that he was hungry, saw him weep, saw him suffer—a real, human Jesus, whom his hands touched, time and again, and whom his eyes beheld. John saw also his glory, wonderful, amazing, a glory such as none could have but the Only-begotten of Father. This Only-begotten of the Father, whom John called Logos, "Thought", tented in Jesus, Son of Man. That was surely a marvel, but not a greater marvel than that both he and we can understand and comprehend it, if explained correctly. *Jesus was really the Son of God and the Son of Man.*

The Lukan Message.

The Gospel of Luke is compiled from several documents. One of these was the Gospel of Mark, another was the *Logia*. A third source was used by both Luke and Matthew, which ran somewhat parallel to the Gospel of Mark, and belonged to the "didactic" group of Gospel documents.

Beside these, Luke made use of a number of late documents of the "doctrinal" type. To this class belong all the documents which he used for his Introduction, Lk 1: 5-2: 52, dealing with the stories of the Annunciation and the birth of John and Jesus.

In the story of the Annunciation Luke made use of at least three documents. One source is not quoted but only referred to. The other two sources were skilfully combined, in the manner in which documents were edited in the Pentateuch and the historical books of the Old Testament. The evidence for this compilation is of the same kind as that generally accepted for determining Old Testament sources: 1) we find here two different formulas for the name, Jesus, and Son of the Most High; 2) two ultimate causes of the conception, angel, and the power of the Most High; 3) there are two greeting formulas, 4) two expressions for Mary's hesitancy, 5) two announcements of the reason for the visit, 6) two messages by the angel, 7) two acceptance formulas; 8) the use of "God" and "Lord;" 9) "house of David" and "house of Jacob;" 10) set phrases; 11) In one source the visitor is called "angel", in the other source he is called "Gabriel;" 12) two complete stories are found interwoven in this narrative.

These two sources, which we have marked II and III, cover also the story of the angel's visit to Zacharias.

In one of these sources (I) it is intimated, and is so expressly said further on (Lk 2: 21), that there was a human conception. In source III it is said that "the Word of God cannot be void of power", and it is this "Word" which was lodged in Mary, and from which the Son of the Most High was to be born.

In the analysis given below Source II appears at the left, and Source III at the right of the page. Material common to both sources is placed in the center of the page.

II

III

And the angel said unto him:

Fear not, Zacharias, because thy supplication is heard, and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord; and he shall be filled with Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn unto the Lord their God. And he shall go before his face in the spirit and power of Elijah, to make ready for the Lord a prepared people.

Thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. He shall drink no wine nor strong drink. He shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient into the wisdom of the just.

And Zacharias said unto the angel,
Whereby shall I know this?

But I am an old man, and my wife advanced in her days.

And the angel answering said unto him,
I bring thee these good tidings: But, behold, thou shalt be silent until the day that these things shall come to pass.

I am Gabriel, that stands in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee: but thou shalt not be able to speak, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season.

And after these days Elizabeth his wife conceived.

And the angel

In the sixth month Gabriel

was sent

to a virgin of the house of David; and the virgin's name

from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to one

was Mariam. And he went betrothed to a man whose
in unto her. name was Joseph.

And he said,
The Lord be with thee! Hail, favored one!
She was greatly troubled at She cast about in her mind
this saying. what manner of salutation
this might be.

And the angel said to her,
Fear not, Mariam! Thou hast found favor with
God,
for behold,
thou shalt conceive in the thou shalt bring forth
womb

a son,
and thou shalt call his name He shall be great, and shall
Jesus; he shall be great; and be called the Son of Most
the Lord shall give unto him High; and he shall reign over
the throne of his father Da- the house of Jacob unto the
vid; and of his kingdom there ages.
shall be no end.

And Mariam said unto the angel,
How shall this be? When I have no knowledge of
a man?

And the angel answered and said to her,
Holy Spirit shall come upon The power of the Most High
thee, wherefore that which is shall overshadow thee. For
to be born shall be called no word of God shall be void
Holy, a Son of God. And be- of power.
hold, Elizabeth, thy kinswo-
man, she also has conceived a
son in her old age: and this is
the sixth month with her that
was called barren.

And Mariam said,
Behold, the handmaid of the Be it unto me according to
Lord! thy word!

And the angel departed from her.

The Lukan sources represent three traditions, two of which deal with the conception of the human nature of Jesus, and the third tradition deals with the conception of the Son of God Most High.

1. The earliest tradition represented Joseph as the father of Jesus: "thy father" (Lk 2:48), said Mary; and again, both father and mother are referred to as "his father and his mother" (Lk 2:33), who are thrice called "his parents" (Lk 2:27, 41, 44), and once "thy father and I" (Lk 2:48).

This tradition agrees with the views expressed in the Gospels of Mark and John, with the conduct of Mary as represented in the Gospel of Mark, and with the views of the people of Nazareth as represented in all the Gospels.

2. The second Lukan tradition represents Jesus as the son of the angel, and therefore as "a Son of God", wherefore he is called "Holy", a perfect man.

The crucial point in this tradition is the interpretation of the passage "he (the angel) went in unto her" (Lk 1:28). The Old Testament phrase "go in unto" (Hebrew *bo el*, LXX *eiserchomai pros*) means constantly *coitus*, *convivo*: "The sons of the Gods went in unto the daughters of the Man, and they bare (children) to them" (Gn 6:4). "And he went in unto Hagar, and she conceived" (Gn 16:4). For further references compare Gn 16:2; 19:33, 34; 29:21, 23, 30; 30:3, 4; 38:2, 8, 9; Dt 21:13; 22:13; 25:3; Jo 23:17; Jd 15:1; 16:1; 17:10; 19:15; 2S 16:21, 23; 17:25; 20:3; 1 Ki 2:21; 1 Chr 2:21; 7:23; Ruth 4:13; Ez 23:44; Am 2:7. Wherever this phrase occurs in the Old Testament with a person as object of "unto", it carries the same meaning. In classical Greek this phrase means "to come in court against", a meaning which is excluded by the context. If Luke made use of a Hebrew source, the Old Testament meaning, as indicated above, is intended, and the angel becomes the ultimate cause of the birth of Jesus, with such limitations as are imposed upon sons of God, "Every one who is begotten of God does no sin, because his seed remains in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God" (1 Jh 3:9). But if this phrase is Luke's own,

it may be a pure Hellenism, and then it may simply mean "to visit."

The angel looked and acted like a human being. There is no reason why Mary should not have taken him for and regarded him as such. Saintly women before her, like the mother of Samuel and the mother of Samson, had become pregnant in a similar manner. The Annunciation to Mary differs in no essentials from that to Elizabeth, who was counted barren, but had now become pregnant. The two annunciations run on parallel lines, and thus there is no reason why Mary should think that her case was different in any particular from that of Elizabeth.

This tradition presupposes either an immaculate conception or else a human conception which was to follow, because the same source adds the information: "And when eight days were fulfilled for *circumcising* him, his name was called Jesus, which was so called by the angel *before* he was conceived in the womb" (Lk 2:21). The statement "before he was conceived in the womb" is remarkable, though capable of two interpretations, depending upon who was the cause of the conception.

This tradition belongs to the same circle as the traditions of the Virgin-birth embodied in the Gospel of Matthew.

3. The third tradition deals with the visit of Gabriel, "who stands in the presence of God", for the purpose of announcing the birth of The Son of God Most High. Gabriel delivered the "Word" and Mary accepted it, "Be it unto me according to thy Word." This constituted the conception of The Son of God, an entirely spiritual act.

This traditions agrees fully with the Johannine statement, that "the Word became flesh", though it adds the information when and how this was done. All statements in the New Testament, purporting to tell of the origin of The Son of God dwelling in Jesus of Nazareth, present no obstacles or contradictions of this tradition.

Mary "wondered", "marveled", was "amazed", when she heard the Song of the Angels, and the tale of the shepherds,

when Simeon and Hannah praised God for her child, and when her son proclaimed himself to be The Son of God his Father. She did not seem to understand this at all. Perhaps she did not. But in order that we may understand this, it is psychologically of primary importance to remember that she "pondered" all these things in her heart. Therefore we ask:

Could Gabriel have visited Mary and announced the birth of The Son of the Most High, without Mary being conscious of the visit at that time? We answer, Yes.

In whatever way Mary was made to act as an agency, in the divine conception of The Son of God, we must not lose sight of the fact that Mary was not aware of this specific commission during Jesus' earthly life. Still Luke's third tradition, the stories of the visit of Gabriel, may readily be accepted. Psychic phenomena of this kind are not unusual and psychologically it is not only possible, but it is more and more recognized that such a mental visit could take place.

Mary was, for the time being, not aware of it, and therefore assumed her stolid indifference, and even hostility toward her son, but she did become aware of it after his death and resurrection. This means that she was neither conscious nor co-conscious of the angel's presence, though the visit actually took place, but that she was supraconscious of it when it happened. In this case her normal consciousness, as well as her subconsciousness, acting through her instincts, were dormant during the visit, while her supraliminal ego was acting. The knowledge, really a superknowledge, of such an action of the supraliminal ego may remain passive within the supraconscious field in man for any length of time, before it is communicated to his conscious or co-conscious agencies. Its realization by consciousness generally depends upon some extraordinary event, as the crucifixion and resurrection could have been and certainly were in the case of Mary. The visit of Gabriel may have been acute reality, and the divine conception of The Son of God may have taken place, without Mary being aware of it at the time it took place. The modern study of psychology is rapidly progressing toward a full

recognition of just such facts as these. And when psychology is studied in the light of the life of Jesus, the visit can be adequately appreciated and Mary's unconsciousness of that visit can be satisfactorily explained. The repeated mentions of Mary "pondering all these things in her heart" (Lk 2:19, 51) are indications of this supraconsciousness which had as yet not dawned upon her consciousness.

With these facts before us, how are we to understand the story of the Annunciation? Is that a mere myth, a collection of mere legends that grew up in Subapostolic times, and was found by Luke and the editor of Matthew's Gospel, and incorporated into these Gospels, without having a foundation in fact? What is the truth about the Virgin-birth?

Could a tradition spring up in the Apostolic age about angels announcing the birth of Jesus, without a foundation in fact for such a tradition? We answer, No.

The Synoptic Gospels, were written in the first century, probably before the year 80 A.D. It is absolutely impossible that a myth upon such an important subject as the birth of Jesus could have risen, be expanded into several forms, reshaped and added to, put into written form, copies of it be broadcasted around the Mediterranean, found credence among disciples who were born in the days of the Master, all the different legends be searched and their evidence be sifted by the Evangelists and incorporated into two of the Gospels, if these traditions had no foundation in fact. John was still living and had as yet not written the fourth Gospel. His conscience would have forced him to contradict openly these traditions, if they had lacked a foundation. And even if John had not cared to challenge these stories, their presence in the Gospels would be an imposture, an outrage which it is incredible, nay, impossible for two Evangelists to have perpetrated. These traditions must have a foundation in fact.

Is it probable that Joseph would have called Jesus his son, if he himself were not his father? We answer, Yes.

Such cases are met with all the time everywhere. In this case it would be particularly so. After the visit of the angel

in the dream, Joseph assumed the conditions as they were, and since he was a man "on the square" and determined "not to make her a public example" (Mt 1:19), he took this attitude during his whole life. He pretended always that he was the father of Jesus. The people of Nazareth knew nothing else, and everybody assumed that Joseph was his father, without a shadow of doubt. Consequently the "amazement" of the parents can be taken in two ways.

Did Mary really not understand the words of Jesus, when he, at the age of twelve, called God his Father? We answer, No.

Mary became simply dumbfounded, when she heard her son use that kind of language. A direct union between God and man was unthinkable in any case, and talk of it was horrible and blasphemous to every faithful Jew. That was the very reason why the Jews became so enraged at Jesus, because he called God his Father. It was because of this, that the Sanhedrin condemned him to death. Both Mary and Joseph were strict Jews, and to hear their son call himself the Son of the Father, would, to say the least, "astonish" them. Such language was enough to cause any Jew to "ponder."

The Mother of The Son of God.

Was Mary the mother of The Son of God? How could she be *Theotokos*, "mother of God? We have heard of the explanation, "It is profound mystery." Surely it would be a mystery. But where is that written? There is not one single word in the Gospels which says that Mary was the mother of The Son of God. On the contrary, it is declared that Holy Spirit would "fall upon Mary", there to stay until the Word was born. "Holy Spirit" is the divine mother, the mother of God, the Queen of Heaven, the Bride. Holy Spirit, and no one else, was the mother of The Son of God. In the Hebrew language "Spirit", *ruach*, is a feminine word.

The Earliest Creed.

The oldest form of the Apostles' Creed, now known, read: "born of Holy Spirit and Mary, the virgin." This form of

the creed marks a transition, the time when the teaching of the disciples passed into a dogma of the Church, which changed the order of the words into "virgin Mary." The primitive form was in certain communities "Holy Spirit and Mary", in other communities it was "Virgin and Mary." Although the Greek *gennao* can mean both "conceive" and "bear", that is, both the male and female agency in procreation, it can not have both meanings at the same time. When therefore it was used both in reference to Holy Spirit and Mary, it must mean "to bear" and nothing else. This ancient creed asserted therefore that both Holy Spirit and Mary conceived a son at one and the same time, and that there was a double birth. In other communities the same thought was expressed by the words "the Virgin and Mary." In the subsequent development *gennao* was replaced by two words, one denoting "to conceive" and the other "to bear", and the word "Virgin" was placed before "Mary". This creed comes from Rome, was written in Greek, about 200 A.D., and had only six articles of faith. The earliest form of the present *Credo Apostolicum* is found in writings of Pirminius, who died in 753 A.D., and contains very little, if any, Apostolic thought. In the Mithras religion the creed was a kind of oath given at the celebration of the mysteries and it looks as if the Christian creed arose in the Pauline churches to serve a similar purpose. 1 Tim 6:12 seems to indicate that a creed was already at that time in use. If so, it was of Pauline origin.

The Subapostolic Message.

From quotations preserved of the Gospel to the Hebrews we learn that Jesus regarded Holy Spirit as his mother, and this view can amply be proved from writings still extant of the disciples of the first, second, and third centuries of our era.

In the Book of Revelation "Bride" and "Holy Spirit" are placed side by side, "And The Spirit and the bride say, Come" (Rv 22:17). But "bride" and "virgin" are often synonymous expressions.

In many early writings, like the Second Epistle of Cle-

ment, Hermas' Shepherd, and the writings of Hegesippus, all written in the middle of the second century, it is stated that the primitive disciples represented the "Virgin" as the "Bride of Christ." The same view is expressed in the Abercius' Inscription, dating from about 200 A.D., and in the Acts of Thomas written in the third century.

This "Virgin" was even regarded as pre-existent, like the Word, and was represented both as the bride and the mother of the Messiah. Clemens of Alexandria, about 180 A.D., says that Christ refused the breast of his earthly mother in order to be the son of a virgin mother, and he adds, "To call her the Assembly is my joy; she is the only mother, who never had milk, for she alone was not a woman. Still she is, at the same time, virgin and mother: pure as a virgin and yet loving as a mother." He spoke, of course, of the heavenly Assembly (Heb 12:23).

Tertullian, writing in the third century, took for granted that we should pray to the heavenly Assembly, the mother of the faithful, while he regarded Mary as a type of the unfaithful synagogue.

The idea that the Assembly of the faithful, in heaven as on earth, was a virgin, was inherited from the Old Testament. The Jewish community, like that of the disciples, was both mother and bride and had the title "Virgin" (Am 8:2; Jr 31:4,21; 18:13; Sibylline Oracles III, 785).

This faith had its roots in universal Oriental symbolism and analogies. It meant a double birth, a birth of both Jesus and Logos, just as we say, that we are born both of a mother and of Mother Earth.

The real trouble with the story of the Virgin-birth lies not in Luke's presentation of it, but in the confusion which has arisen between Son of God and Messiah, or Christ, a confusion which was started by Paul and has been continued by modern scholars. They treat these terms as identical, and on that account they have been driven to question and even to deny the Virgin-birth, and place therefore the birth of The Son of God at the baptism of Jesus. On that account they have

been forced to assume that late legends have been incorporated into the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, telling stories about the conception and nativity of Jesus, which could have no foundation in fact. Criticism has as yet not succeeded in discrediting this material, nor will it ever succeed in it, because it has started from a false premise, namely that Christ and The Son of God are one and the same thing.

The Apostolic teaching emphasized that the conception of The Son of God was after a divine plan, as was that of Jesus in Luke's second source. There was only one personality born by Mary, who received the name Jesus, though that personality had two egos, one human, the other divine. The present advance in the science of Psychology makes it impossible to deny the existence of two egos in a man, but this psychology has as yet not been able to tell us how the divine ego,—“the subliminal self” as it has most improperly been termed—is conceived in man. The Bible tells us that, and we are profoundly thankful for it. The birth of the Messiah is also told in the Bible, and that too has its analogies in human psychology, though this science has still to be revolutionized before it can give an adequate description of such a birth, as it is wrought about in man.

The Message of Jesus.

The three sources, used by Luke and reflecting three traditions, left some facts unexplained in regard to the conception of Jesus. One thing, though, seems clear and decisive, that the divine nature of Jesus, The Son of God, was conceived by a “Word of God” sent through Gabriel to Mary. This statement was contained in the third Lukan source, and is not contested by other Gospel sources.

But Luke's first and second sources left it undecided, who was the father and the cause of the human nature of Jesus, whether he was “a Son of God”, or a mere man, “the son of Joseph.” We have presented the two traditions, one clustering around “a Son of God” in the Gospel of Matthew and the second Lukan source, the other gathering momentum around

"the son of Joseph", presented in the Gospels of Mark and John and the first Lukan source, and attested by utterances of Mary and by popular belief. Which of the two was he? Can this question be settled?

There is a message, recorded by all the Gospels, from Jesus himself, which ought to settle this question in the minds of all who really care to be convinced. This message is contained in the two titles which Jesus has in the Gospels, "Son of God" and "Son of Man", both of which he himself used, and which he gave to himself, though he preferred, by far, the latter title.

Son of God.

We have already seen that in the second Lukan source reference is made to a birth of "a Son of God", while Luke's third source deals with "The Son of God Most High." These two titles are by no means synonymous.

"The Son of God" refers to a unique, divine personality, who is identical with "Logos", the "Firstborn", and the "Only-begotten." There is only one such being known in the whole Bible, and that is the Mediator, who stands between God and man and who is the Creator of all.

The other title, "Son of God", represents Jesus as the foremost among a large number of holy beings, angels and men, who belong to the Kingdom of the Heavens, of which Jesus is the King. "Sons of God", or in Old Testament phraseology, "sons of *the* Gods", are equivalent to "divine sons."

In all the Gospels occur references to both terms.

In the Gospel of Mark the title "Son of God" occurs only once (Mk 15:39), and is used by a soldier at the cross. He made Jesus equal to one of the gods of Rome. The title "The Son of God" occurs also, but only in Mk 3:11, and is used by an unclean spirit who certainly ought to know what he was talking about.

In the Gospel of Luke "Son of God" is ascribed to Adam (Lk 3:38) and to Jesus by the angel (Lk 1:35) and by the devil at the "temptation" (Lk 4:3,9). The title "The Son of God" is used by a member of the Sanhedrin (Lk 22:70) and

twice by demons (Lk 4:41; 8:28), in the last case in the form of "thou Son of the Most High God."

In Matthew the title "a Son of God" is used by the devil (Mt 4:3, 6), by the disciples when Jesus walked on the waves (Mt 14:33) and by the mockers and a centurion at the cross (Mt 27:40, 43, 54). The title "The Son of God" is used by a demon (Mt 8:29), by Peter in his confession (Mt 16:16) and by the high priest (Mt 26:63).

In the Synoptics Jesus does not once appropriate either of these titles, though he did not refuse them, when others called him so. In the parables on the Vineyard and the Wedding Feast he implied that he was "The Son of God." The owner of the Vineyard and the King at the Wedding Feast are represented as having "an only Son."

In the Gospel of John Jesus took the opportunity to explain why he had a perfect right to call himself "a Son of God." The Jews tried to stone him because he had said, "I and my Father are one" (Jh 10:30). Then "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word came, say ye of him, whom the Father has made holy and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am son of God" (Jh 10:34-36). Jesus had a perfect right to this title. Therefore he uses the same title again of himself at the grave of Lazarus, "that (a) son of God might be glorified" (Jh 11:4), and Martha expresses the same thought (Jh 11:27). Before Pilate the Jews accused him of saying that he was "a Son of a God" (Jh 19:7). Otherwise his title in the Gospel of John is constantly "The Son of God" given by John the Baptist (Jh 1:34), by Nathanael (Jh 1:49), by himself (Jh 3:18; 5:25), by the author of this Gospel (Jh 20:31), and by Peter that he was the "Holy One of God" (Jh 6:69).

A clear distinction between the two titles "Son of God" and "The Son of God" is maintained throughout, in all the Gospels, and should ever be maintained, because he was both a Son of God and The Son of God. This distinction is the

more important because "The Son of God" refers to his divine nature, while "Son of God" indicates his human nature.

Jesus of Nazareth was, then, not the son of Joseph.

Son of Man.

The title which he assumed from the beginning of his ministry to designate himself as a Son of God was "Son of Man." This title occurs some eighty times in the Gospels, and at least ten, if not twelve, times in the Fourth Gospel. Outside of the Gospels it occurs in the New Testament only once, in Acts 7: 56, at the death of Stephen, once in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2: 6), in a quotation from the Old Testament (Ps 8: 4), and twice in the Book of Revelation (1: 13; 14: 14), where it designates Jesus as the King of his supramundane Kingdom.

This "Son of Man" was pre-existent: "And no man has ascended into heaven, except he that descended out of heaven, Son of Man" (Jh 3: 13). Since heaven was his original home, he retains ever relations with it and its inhabitants, the angels. Thus he promised his first disciples that "ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man" (Jh 1: 51). For "every one who shall confess in me before men, in him shall also the Son of Man confess before the angels of God" (Lk 12: 8). His real home is in that heaven in which the angels dwell, and they are his servants, and them he will send "to gather the tares from the wheat in his Kingdom" (Mt 13: 41).

The Son of Man is a priest, even here on earth, "For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mk 10: 45; Mt 20: 28). Therefore he has the power to forgive sins, "That ye may know that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house" (Mk 2: 10; Mt 9: 6; Lk 5: 24). The authority for his healing ministry was likewise vested in his priesthood as functioning in forgiving sins. Furthermore, as a priest the Son of Man must offer sacrifices; and therefore he brings himself as a sacrifice for the world: "He began to teach them, that the

Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected”(Mk 8: 31), because “the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost”(Lk 19: 10). He was a sacrificial lamb given into the hands of priests to be offered up: “The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him”(Mk 9: 31; 14: 21). “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believes in him may have eternal life”(Jh 3: 14, 15). On this account he prepares the sacrificial meal for those who belong to him: “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in you”(Jh 6: 53). It is not the flesh of the human Jesus but of the divine Son of Man, and no transubstantiation or consubstantiation is needed in order to produce this “flesh.” The Son of Man is therefore the guardian of the mysteries of the Kingdom: “Work not for the meat which perishes, but for the meat which abides to eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you, for him the Father—God—has sealed”(Jh 6: 27).

The Son of Man is “*the* Prophet”, “He that sows the good seed is the Son of Man”(Mt 13: 37). “For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels”(Mk 8: 38; Lk 9: 26).

As King “the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath”(Mk 2: 28) already during his earthly life. “For the Father . . . gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man”(Jh 5: 26-27). On the cross and at the resurrection he gave ample proof of his Kingship; this glorification was begun even before the betrayal: “The hour is come that the Son of Man shall be glorified”(Jh 12: 23). “What then if ye shall see the Son of Man ascending where he was before?” (Jh 6: 62).

This King shall return at the Parousia. “Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven”(Mk 14: 62). This “coming” shall be sudden (Mt 24: 27, 37, 44, 39), in his own sign: “And

then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven"(Mt 24:30). "They shall see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory"(Mk 13:26), at a time not far distant: "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come"(Mt 10:23).

In order to participate in this *Parousia* a "rebirth" of his followers is necessary: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel"(Mt 19:28).

As King the Son of Man shall execute the final judgment: "But when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations"(Mt 25:31—32a). The King of Truth has won the final victory.

During his earthly life the Son of Man appeared like other men: "The Son of Man came, eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners"(Mt 10:19; Lk 7:34). He was not an ascetic, just the opposite, and thus he showed the Way for his followers. But he needed love: "The Son of Man has not where to lay his head"(Mt 8:20; Lk 9:58). He meant, of course, a human bosom where to lean his head when he lay down to meals. He was not in need of a home, for he and his family had a good home in Capernaum, and probably still owned their home in Nazareth. He needed love, but not of the kind that Judas offered: "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?"(Lk 22:45).

It is thus apparent that this title, Son of Man, means the same as "Son of God."

It is certain that Jesus did not manufacture this title. On the contrary it had often been used in the Old Testament. As far back as the time of Moses, Balaam referred to "Son of Man" and placed him between God and man: "God is not as man, that he should lie; nor as a Son of Man that he should be threatened"(Nu 23:19, LXX). In Job man is contrasted with Son of Man in the same way as unrighteousness is contrasted

with righteousness (Job 35:8), and in the Psalms man and Son of Man are again contrasted, so that God remembers man, but he visits a Son of Man (Ps 8:4; cf. Ps 143:3; Is 51:13; 56:2). "God makes the Son of Man strong" (Ps 80:17). In Ezekiel God calls the prophet "Son of Man" after having made him a prophet (Ez 2:1, 3, 6, 8;; 3:1, 3, 4, etc.)

In Daniel "Son of Man" is fully described and is the title of the Son of God: "I beheld in the night vision, and, lo, one coming with the clouds, as a Son of Man, and he came on to the Ancient of days, and was brought near to him. And to him was given the dominion, which shall not pass away, and his Kingdom shall not be destroyed" (Dn 7:13—14).

In the "Similitudes" of the Book of Enoch, written in the beginning of the first century, B.C., are several references to the Son of Man: "And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was" (46:1). "For the Son of Man has appeared and sits on the throne of his glory" (49:29).

"Son of Man" was therefore a title well known in the Old Testament. What was the origin of it? Why did the Jews not understand it? And why did Jesus come to adopt it?

Some critics argue that Jesus spoke Aramaic, and in Aramaic "Son of Man", *barnasha*, or *bar-anash*, means simply "man", which cannot be denied. But when the same critics argue that Jesus, by choosing this title, wanted to emphasize that he was a mere, common human being, both their premises and deductions are wrong. All the Jews, in the time of Jesus, spoke Aramaic. Still, they did not understand what Jesus meant with this title: "How sayest thou, The Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?" (Jh 12:34).

This settles it. Jesus had put a special meaning into this title, which neither the Jews nor any one else—modern critics not excepted—has to this time been able to understand, or to explain. Was there then, a "Man" who could be equalized with God, an expression which Jesus made use of? We should at the outset remember that God was often used in the Old

Testament as denoting "divine." When Luke calls Adam "Son of God" (Lk 3:38), he deviates a good deal from common views, for Paul's view was that Adam, through his "fall", became the progenitor of the sinful race of men, the "old Adam." Was there more than one Adam? Apparently not, but *Adam* means "man", and there could be some other *Adam*, some other "man", even earlier than the father of Cain, whom Jesus might have regarded as a "Son of God" and from whom he took his title "Son of Man."

There are two "creation" stories in the Book of Genesis, one related in Gn 1:1-2:3, the other in Gn 2:4b-25. They are by no means identical, nor do they refer to the same event. The first story refers to the creation of "Man", a spiritual man, created "in the image and as the likeness of God", who should "have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth" (Gn 1:26). This sounds peculiarly familiar to one who has read the Gospel story of Jesus, how Jesus could send Peter to catch a fish in order to get a half shekel to pay their temple dues. He could walk upon the waves, still the storm, change water into wine, and feed thousands with a few loaves. If the description of that primitive man is true, then he could truly be called a "son of God" and still his name was "Man", nothing else. But he and his descendants are, now and again, called "sons of the Gods" in the Bible. These men are presented under the name of the "sons of the Gods" in Gn 6:2, 4, and in Job 1:6; 2:1 they appear before the Lord, and Satan joined their company, because he had once been one of them and claimed "dominion over the earth." But though being "sons of the Gods" they were also "sons of Man", and each one of them could be called a "Son of Man." When Jesus took the title "Son of Man", it is but natural that he should have compared himself to this primitive, perfect, spiritual man, whom he represented in every detail.

Both heaven and earth were abodes of these "sons of the Gods." We read of the Lord, when he appeared to Abram at

Mamre, that the patriarch saw three "men" (Gn 18:1-2), whom he invited to a meal (Gn 18:6-9), and with two of these "men" he walked for a while when they "went" to Sodom (Gn 18:16). In Gn 19:1, these "men" are called "angels", who accepted the invitation to sleep in Lot's house over night. What is the difference in this story between the Lord, the men, and the angels?

Furthermore, we read in the same story that "then the Lord caused to rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven" (Gn 19:24). The Hebrew text uses *Jahveh* in both expressions for "Lord." There are therefore two Jahvehs, one of which causes the other to rain. The latter plays the role of *Jove*, the *Jupiter Pluvius* of the Romans. We have already seen that a Jahveh was called both angel and man, and acted as a man.

Jesus regarded himself as "Son of Man" exactly in this sense, and he could therefore be called both "Lord" and "Man", as well as "Son of God" and "Son of Man", and the latter title becomes thus exceedingly apt, the "Son of Man" who had dominion over everything.

The story of the second creation, Gn 2:4b-25, is in reality no creation story at all, but deals with "forming" "the man", i. e., raising "the man" into a higher level of culture. This man was not able to remain in the Paradise, because of "eating of the tree of knowing." This man is Paul's "first Adam", while his "second Adam" is the man of Gn 1:26-27, as revealed in Jesus Christ.

A study of "the Son of Man" in the light of Gn 1:26 gives us a clearer picture of the Son of Man, and just such a one as the four Gospels mean to present. There is a race which can be called both "Sons of Man" and "Sons of God." Jesus of Nazareth was one of them, and his mission was to extend his Kingdom to make men "sons of God" and citizens of that Kingdom.

Why did Jesus chose this title "Son of Man?" The answer is not difficult to find. It expressed exactly what he was and what he thought, and still it hid his true personality from

the multitude to which he remained a stranger. People had to take an interest in him, before they could understand what this title meant. Still, it was plain enough to invite men to a search for its meaning. His title was like his speech. He never "cast pearls to swine." But for those who became interested in him, this title was explained and became a most wonderful source for spiritual ideals, and an impelling force to become a real superman, a man just like the "Son of Man."

Conclusion.

This mass of seemingly conflicting evidence, even from the eyewitnesses, in regard to the Annunciation and the conception of Jesus, can be reduced to harmony and be acceptable as historic facts, without doing violence to any tradition, and without violating the laws of Physiology and Psychology, on the following propositions.

1. The Annunciation concerned only the conception of The Son of God and consisted in a message that Holy Spirit was to bring forth the Logos, the "Word" of God, in "flesh", which was to dwell in a son whom Mary was to bear. This act was entirely spiritual, and was not understood by Mary until after the resurrection.

2. The father of Jesus was a "Man of God." Therefore Jesus called himself "Son of Man" and a "Son of God." The secret of this fatherhood was scrupulously guarded by Joseph and Mary, and the latter regarded Jesus as a common human being, whom Joseph accepted as his son. Mark, John, and the people of Nazareth looked upon Jesus as the son of Joseph, and knew nothing else.

3. The Gospels are silent upon the subject, how Jesus came to know that he was a son of a "Man of God."

THE CREATION STORY. The Creation Story, Gen. 1:1 to 2:3, contains the outlines of Biblical Cosmology, or the origins of the universe. As a literary product it is a most beautiful piece of composition, which has no rival in ancient folklore of any nation in the way of representing "origins."

This story is part of the Book of Genesis, and, therefore, a

part of the Bible. It is thus assumed to be inspired and to contain truth.

Against its truthfulness it has been argued:

1. Modern science is supposed to have shown that the universe could not have been made in six days, as this story pretends to teach. The answer is that the "six-days" paragraphs have been inserted by a later hand. Some "teaching" priest in the time of Asa or Jehoshaphath made these insertions for the purpose of arguing the necessity of keeping the Sabbath.

2. This story asserts that light appeared before the heavenly bodies were made. The answer is that light here denotes "the light of life", as in John 1:4, the inner light, the light realities, the inherent light of a body, whether mundane or supra-mundane.

3. It is objected that this story teaches that God provided only vegetable food for the animals, though the science of palaeontology proves that the beasts of prey have always been carnivorous. True. But the latest discoveries in the field of Anthropology push the first appearance of man on earth far back into the middle of the Tertiary Age, and it seems now more probable that the first man was upon earth before a beast of prey existed. If so, this statement becomes entirely correct.

4. Bishop Ussher computed that the birth of Adam took place about 4004 B. C. According to the Greek text this event took place about 5500 B. C. Anthropologists and palaeontologists, however, claim that man has been on earth perhaps more than 100,000 years and therefore refute this story of the creation of man. This depends on an entirely arbitrary identification of Gen. 1:27 and 5:1. The Bible nowhere says that Adam was the first man. The first man of our text is represented as living exclusively of fruit and seeds. He is the eolithic man of modern Anthropology. Adam, on the other hand, lived at the time when gold and precious stones were known and the art of pottery had appeared. He represents the man of the neolithic age in modern Anthropology. Surely, there is here no cleft between the Bible and modern science.

5. The evolutionary hypothesis of Darwin's "survival of the fittest" and the evolution of higher species from the lower is so accidental and arbitrary that it cannot be entertained seriously by any progressive scholar. Darwin's theory has not been proved and we doubt if it ever can be proved. All it has to offer are a number of similarities, but the gap between similarities and identities is greater than the gap between the Bible

and science. The problem of man deals not only with organic structure, but also with the origin of mind.

6. Modern Anthropology assumes that primitive man was ignorant, helpless, a thrall of magic, while the first man of the Bible is represented as the image of God, possessing unlimited power over nature. True! But history tells us of the fall of men and nations. What has become of the great Babylon and Nineveh, of Thebes, of the Athens of Pericles and the Rome of Augustus? What, if primitive man fell? Would he not become awkward? Still, the sculptures of early man in the caves of France and Spain seem to show that he was not an entirely ignorant beast.

There is nothing intrinsically untrue in the Creation Story, when later additions are removed from it. It contains nothing in strict opposition to verified facts. On the other hand it may be well to remember that the latest discoveries in science tend to warn scientists not to claim too much, not to be too certain and, before all, not to boast views that are mere theories. Furthermore, serious objections against the trustworthiness of a literary document can justly be made if that document has proceeded from one mind. Besides, it is not fair to compare a sermon on the Sabbath with a scientific treatise on geology. The study of the Bible is also a science and must proceed by the laws of that science. Reading a translation does not make a man a Bible student, nor does a smattering of Greek and Hebrew make him a Bible scholar. If a geologist wants to criticise the Creation Story, let him beware, if he is not competent for that task. But if we find Bible and science agree, then two new questions arise: Either did the Biblical author have access to an aw-inspiring science that now is lost, or else he had access to a revelation from the fountain of eternal Truth. Modern science has no control of absolute truth—science is only empiric.

Is the Creation Story a literary unit? We have already indicated our doubt in this matter by asserting that the sections dealing with the "days" are late insertions. These sections can be removed without changing the story materially. Is the rest a unit?

The Documentary and Evolutionary hypotheses of Higher Criticism maintains, of course, that the whole story is a literary unit.

In studying this document we find the same peculiarities that otherwise indicate composite authorship. Thus we may call attention to the following idioms:

1. What seems to be identical ideas are expressed by two, sometimes three different words, like "rule", "herbs", "bird", "make" and "create", "likeness" and "image."

2. Different forms of the same word or phrase, e. g., "divide", "between", "yield seed", "beast", "after its kind", "reptiles", "moving", "over", "under."

3. Different connotations of the same word, e. g., "give" and "appoint", "be", "become" and "appear." Other words have both a common and a mythological connotation, like "day", "night", "darkness", "light", "earth", "heavens."

4. Finally, a number of set phrases occur, now and again, each followed by another set phrase. Thus "and God commanded" occurs ten times and followed in eight cases by "it became so"; "and God made" or its equivalent occur eight times, followed by "and God saw that (it was) good"; "and evening came" etc., is followed by "day one, day second", etc., not less than six times. Beside these, the word for "design" or "create" occurs three times, introducing a specific act of creation.

This seems sufficient to call for an inquiry into the sources of this document.

The Creation Story is not a literary unit either in language or contents. Taking the set phrases "God said", "God made", "create" and "evening came" as a guide, the material of the context groups itself easily around these four phrases, and we get four almost complete sources, three of which deal with creative acts viewed from different angles, and the fourth document uses this compilation for a midrash or sermon on the sanctity of the Sabbath.

These four sources were written in the dialects of the two tribes of Levi, the L(evitical) and the A(aronic). The people of Levi never formed a political or religious unit. There were always two tribes of the Levites, each using a dialect of its own, one obeying the legislation at Horeb, the other the code given at Sinai, and each had its own history. These tribal peculiarities of Levi are reflected in these sources.

The source dealing with "design" or "create" was written in the Levitical (L) dialect and contains a wonderful, highly interesting excerpt from an ancient mythology that apparently belonged to the traditions of this tribe. It has a vocabulary of its own, a number of peculiar phrases not to be found in the other sources, and uses grammatical forms that belong to the earliest strata of the known Hebrew language.

The source dealing with the "sayings" and the "work" ("made") are written in the Aaronic dialect (A), with a carac-

teristic vocabulary and, here and there, old, obsolete grammatical forms, like the old nominative ending in -u.

The fourth source, that of "days", was written by a priest of Judah in the Aaronic dialect, as that was developed in Jerusalem during the early kingdom. This source will be denoted as the P(riestly).

The A(aronic) sources were first combined into one document and then combined with the L(evitical). In this compilation the L source suffered a good deal, as its material was quite heterogeneous to that of the A sources. Much of L was omitted, apparently, and the end of its story comes very abruptly. Whatever was dissonant with the A sources was scrapped mercilessly.

A "teaching" priest or Levite in the time of Asa and Jehoshaphat found this three-source document and saw how admirable and adaptable it was for a midrash on the Sabbath (II Chron. 15:3; 17:9). He divided it into six parts, added his phrase "and evening came", etc., and the "day." It thus became a text for a panoramic presentation of a drama on "Creation" in six acts, to which he added his sermon on the Sabbath.

The earliest (L) source of the Creation Story is not specifically Hebrew in origin, though it became clothed in the garb of Hebrew language and thought and thus preserved from oblivion. It is a part of the common heritage of ancient culture. In its present form it reflects the early religion of the tribe of Levi, the Lapaya of the Amarna Period. It moves among early Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, and Nordic ideas. In spite of this, or perhaps because of this, it came to form the basis for the teaching presented in the prologue to John's Gospel. One of its phrases, "to fill", in the formula of the blessing, became the foundation of the teaching on the *pleroma*, the divine "fullness." Other phrases found in this source came to serve similar purposes, as is evident from expressions like "Light", "Darkness", "Deep", "Day" and "Night", a creation by "Water and Spirit", etc.

The Aaronic (A) sources come closer to Hebrew religious thought, though "God" is still viewed from the cosmological aspect as "Gods" who gather in their divine council chamber to consult on the creation of their son, the Man.

The compilation of these sources was apparently made for the purpose of presenting an oracle on the origin of the "image of God." A nobler piece of diction on Man has never been written, and an idea as sublime as this has never, before or afterwards, been produced by man. Well may this Man be called a "Son of God!" And when the Son of Man took this perfect

man, "the image of God", for his prototype, he chose the noblest there was to select from, the real Superman.

This final redaction cannot have taken place later than in the early kingdom. The P language of this text belongs to this early period and must precede the language of Ezekiel at least three hundred years. Its naive representation of God, who becomes so tired of his work that he needs a rest after six days of labor, is entirely out of harmony with the age of Ezekiel or any of the prophets. Its acquiescence in the polytheism of v. 26, "God said, Let us make man in our image", its presentation of the heavenly bodies "for signs and for seasons", are unthinkable in the Prophetic age. It could be admitted into the Scriptures of the seventh century B.C. only because of the venerable age of the document and its midrashic usefulness.

The original sources reflect the religion of the pre-Mosaic age, the second patriarchal age, and the time of the early judges.

We offer herewith the text of the original sources. Passages in bold face denote restorations from the Greek text, and words in brackets are our restoration of phrases omitted by the compilers.

L

A 1

A 2

1. In Beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

2. But the earth consisted of Deep and Water: and Darkness (was) upon the face of Deep, while Divine Spirit (was) brooding upon the face of the Waters.

3. Then light appeared.

4. And God called to the light Day, and to Darkness he called Night.

(P) 5. And evening came, and morning came: Day One.

6. (Then) a firmament appeared in the midst of the waters,

7. for God caused to divide between the waters which (were) beneath the firmament and the waters which

3. And God commanded, Let light appear. And it became (so).

6. And God commanded, Let a divider appear between the waters, for the waters. And it became so.

3. God (made) light.

4. And God saw that (it was) good.

7. And God made the firmament.

L

(were) above the firmament.

8. And God called to the firmament Heavens.

(P) 8. And evening came, and morning came: Day Second.

9. Then the dry land became visible.

10. And God called to the dry land Earth, and to the systems of the waters he called Seas.

A 1

9. And God commanded, Let the waters under the heavens be gathered into one place. And it became so.

11. And God commanded, Let the earth grow vegetation, herbs yielding seed according to their kinds, and fruit-trees producing fruit according to their kinds upon the earth. And it became so.

A 2

8. And God saw that (it was) good.

9. And the waters under the heavens were gathered into their assemblies.

10. And God saw that (it was) good.

12. And the earth brought forth vegetation, herbs yielding seed according to their kinds, and fruit-trees producing fruit, in which were their seed, according to their kinds.

And God saw that (it was) good.

(P) 13. And evening came, and morning came: Day Third.

14. (Then) the luminaries appeared in the firmament of the heavens to divide between the day and the night,

15. and to be for light in the firmament of the heavens, to shine upon the earth:

16. the greater luminary for the regulation of the day, and the lesser luminary for the regulation of the night.

14. And God commanded, Let luminaries appear, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years.

15. And it became so.

16. And God made the two great luminaries, and the stars.

17. And God appointed them in the firmament of the heavens to shine upon the earth,

18. and to regulate the day and the night, and to divide between the light and the darkness.

And God saw that (it was) good.

(P) 19. And evening came, and morning came: Day Fourth.

20. (Then there appeared) living souls upon the face of the firmament of the heavens;

21. for God created the great dragons, moving and winged things.

22. And God blessed them, saying: Be fruitful, and lordly, and "fill" the waters in the

20. And God commanded, Let the waters swarm swarms, and let fowl fly over the earth. And it became so.

21. And God (made) all kinds of living souls with which the waters teem according to their kinds, and all kinds of fowl according to their kinds.

L

seas and let the fowl
lord over the earth.

(P) 23. And evening came, and morning came: Day Fifth.

27. Then God created
the man in his image:
male and female cre-
ated he them.

28. And God blessed
them, saying: Be fruit-
ful, and lordly, and
"fill" the earth, and
subdue her.

A 1

24. And God comman-
ded, Let the earth
bring forth living souls
according to their kind,
cattle, and reptiles, and
land-beasts, according
to their kinds. And it
became so.

26. And God comman-
ded, Let (there be)
man in our likeness.

28. And God comman-
ded, Rule over the
fishes of the sea, and
over the fowl of the
havens, and over every
beast moving upon the
earth.

29. And God comman-
ded, Behold, I have
given to you all the
herbs yielding seed,
which are upon the
earth, and every tree
in which is the fruit
of a tree yielding seed:
to you it shall be for
food;

30. and to all the
beasts of the earth, and
to every fowl of the
heavens, and to every
moving thing upon the
earth (I have given)
every herb for food.
And it became so.

A 2

And God saw that
(it was) good.

25. And God made the
beasts of the land ac-
cording to their kinds,
and the cattle accord-
ing to their kinds, and
all kinds of reptiles of
the ground according
to their kinds.

And God saw that
(it was) good.

26. And God made
man, to rule over the
fishes of the sea, and
over the fowl of the
heavens, and over the
whole earth, and over
all the reptiles moving
upon the earth.

31. And God saw all
which he had made
and, behold, (it was)
exceedingly good.

(P) 31. And evening came, and morning came: Day the Sixth.

2:1. And the heavens and the earth were completed, and all
their hosts.

2. For God completed on the SIXTH day his work which he had
made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work
which he had made.

3. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because
in it he rested from all his work which he had designed
to make.

CHAPTER V.

Birth of Jesus.

The birth of Jesus took place during the reign of Herod the Great. This king died shortly before the Passover, year 4, B.C. At that time Quirinius was raising an army in Syria for the war against the Homonadenses in Cilicia. Luke specifies, that it happened during a census, or "enrolment", in Judea, during the reign of emperor Augustus. The date was probably May 20, year 5, B.C.

The child born by Mary partook of his mother's nature to the same extent as other children partake of the nature of their mothers. Whoever the father may be, a child can be born only on the condition that it receives a human body from its mother. Jesus could not be a son of Mary, had he not received from her a human nature that contained the essentials of all that pertains to human beings. No laws of nature nor any functions of the body were suspended either in his mother or in himself from the moment that the embryo started its evolution to his birth, or after the birth, both when he was nourished at his mother's breast and in his later growth. The narratives of his birth, as told in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew, do not conflict in any way with this statement, nor could they contradict it, if Jesus was a real human being. For "he was like us *in all things*, except sin." The body of Jesus was of the same kind, as was the body of his mother Mary. Hunger and thirst, pains and need of sleep and rest, were felt by this child, as they come to every child.

"An angel of the Lord" announced the birth of Jesus to some shepherds in the words, "For behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people: for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is an anointed lord"(Lk 2:10—11). The description of the angel is the same as that of the angel who appeared at the

Annunciation. Apparently the same angel was acting at both occasions.

The angel describes the newborn child as a Saviour, "an anointed lord." Nothing is said of a birth of The Son of the Most High. Consequently The Son of the Most High was not born when Jesus was born. At the most, it was a Son of God whom Mary had born, a child which was a "healer", because it was an "anointed lord", one in which "power" was vested and lodging.

Saviour means "healer", "deliverer", and "joybringer." Apparently this title includes all that the word "healing" includes — a healer of bodily infirmities, of diseases, one who can cast out social evils and demons, who can restore both body and soul to normal functions. This healing power was vested in him from birth, because he was "an anointed lord", not a teacher, or Rabbi, or Master, but "a lord", "a ruler", "one invested with power."

But though he was born a "lord invested with power" and therefore a "prince", he could not exercise this power until he got authority to exercise it, and this child was not born with that authority. That commission had yet to come.

Externally Jesus was a human being, a child born of a woman. By whom was he invested with power to heal? His mother could not impart that power to him. She could not impart more than she had. Such a power must be imparted from the father and, since we are not told, and it seems most unlikely, that Joseph could impart this gift to Jesus, Joseph could not be his father. If Jesus was born with this power, he must have received it from a father, whose nature was such that he could impart the power to heal to a child of his. The office of Saviour, the healing power, was a part of his bodily nature, and he must therefore be a Son of God. The human nature of Jesus was of the kind that is characteristic for "sons of God".

Since any human being can become a son of God, he can also be invested with the power to heal and become "an anointed lord." This is the great message from the manger

in Bethlehem, "the good tidings of joy" which only an angel can bring, and we are profoundly thankful for that message. Man is really greater than he knows, and can become greater than he ever aspired, for as soon as he is "born from above", he becomes an "anointed lord", and has the power to heal, if he gets the commission and "authority" so to do.

The Healer.

"And when eight days were fulfilled for circumcising him, his name was called JESUS" (Lk 2: 21).

He was called Jesus, not only because the angel had commanded that he should be called by that name, but because he was going to fill an office and carry out a work, the nature of which was implied in that name. Jesus means "healer", "he who heals." His office was to heal men.

The world was sick to the core, had always been sick, is so yet. There was nothing whole in man. Humanity, Jews and Gentiles alike, had become sick, diseased in soul, in mind, in body, was in the grip of demons and evil, suffering, exhausted, gasping for a breath of life, dying or ready to die, with hope lost and no redemption in sight. Everything which the world had produced was sick, diseased, putrescent, stinking. The world is so yet.

Then Jesus came. He was a healer and set about to heal men, bodies and souls of men. Sick bodies meant sick souls and sick minds. The whole man had to be made whole, "be saved", be healed.

Could the world be saved? Yes! But it belonged to the devil, and Jesus was not sent to heal evil, or to save the devil. He was sent to heal men. Therefore he came to create a new world, a world peopled by sons of God, a world in which there was no sickness, no mental or social or bodily diseases, a Paradise, a brotherhood of harmony, of peace, of right thinking, of sound living, an empire greater and better than the Roman empire, than the Greek empire of Alexander, than the empires of Egypt, of Babylonia and Assyria, of Persia, of Israel, all which had crumbled and passed away. Empires

had been and were failures, statecraft was a failure, communism and churches have been and are failures, education has been and is a failure, a thin varnish smeared over a crater of a living volcano. The world has been and is growing worse, incurable, condemned to death. Such a world Jesus had to recreate before he could heal it.

But Jesus could heal man. And he had a new world, a new empire to offer man, and this empire he called the Kingdom, the Kingdom of the Heavens, the Kingdom of God, a Paradise. The name was not new, not even the idea was new, but its realization was new. No one had as yet realized it. But Jesus came with "power and authority" to heal men, to place them in the Kingdom, and to make them possessors of "health, prosperity, and life." This Kingdom exists already in this world—"within man"—and in the world to come. On earth it is realized in the Brotherhood. True, this name does not occur in the Gospels, because it was a secret organization, a mystery, but its members are known and mentioned in the Gospels, "the brothers of Jesus", and it was in operation on the day of his resurrection. Man has to be healed and fitted to enter the Kingdom, for Life on earth and Life in the heavens, a full, complete, perfect Life; for health now and hereafter; for an endless prosperity to be available at once and to last for ever. Such was his world, his empire, his Kingdom.

Of course, certain conditions must be fulfilled in order to have the privilege of entering the Kingdom of the Healer. And he used certain methods too, his own methods, in healing man and making him a citizen of the heavens. These methods were preaching, healing and serving. Few men understand what these terms mean. How can they? They were terms used in his Brotherhood. He never expected men to understand them until they had entered the Kingdom and become his "brothers." He studiously guarded that the secrets of the Kingdom should not leak out.

The condition was "repentance." He never called for conversions, for spiritual convulsions, for religious spasms, for evangelistic meetings—he regarded such people as

"possessed" by demons, and healed them by casting out the demons from them. We need this healing today, when religion has flattened into "revivals", hypocrisy and Pharisaism. The sole condition imposed by Jesus was *repentance*, "change of mind," "change of purpose in life", "a living with reason", for that is what the Greek word for "repentance", *metanoia*, means, and it means nothing else. Jesus demanded and demands today, that men must change mind and know themselves, be themselves and conduct their lives along lines of reason. When men are willing to do that, to sacrifice self, in order to be themselves, then they are fit to enter the Kingdom. They have been healed.

The Kingdom must be entered here on earth, now. Jesus knew that it was an undertaking on a large scale, and he knew also, that not all would heed his call and enter in. Nor could he throw pearls to swine, or sacrifices to the dogs. But some would and many did listen to his preaching and heeded his call, to inquire and get information.

At that moment he ceased to preach for them and started to teach them. And he taught them, until they could teach others, and teach themselves. Teach what? Yes, that the Kingdom is a real Brotherhood, which dispenses Life, Prosperity, and Health—nothing more and nothing less—a brotherhood of men, by men, for men who are sons of God and brothers of Jesus the Healer.

When this teaching is understood, his healing assumes a new aspect and becomes a service, a mystery, a ministry to men, of washing the feet of disciples and brothers, of breaking bread, of healing the sick, of wiping away tears, of lighting the lamps, of perfuming the healthy, of fraternizing with outcasts, of hearing and doing the will of the Father, of entering the fire, of surrendering and sacrificing self, of giving up and selling *all*.

The Deliverer.

Jesus was a Deliverer. The Old Testament is full of names which denote "deliverer." *Moseh* was a "deliverer", and his name implies that his office, his life-work, was "deliver-

ance." It was not a name, but a title which became his name, because his original name was *Mo-useh*, "One Drawn Out of Water." *Joshua* means "Jahveh is delivering, saving, healing." *Isaiah* means the same. *Elishua* and *Elisha* mean "My God is Deliverance" or "Deliverer." *Hoshea* means "One Who Causes to Deliver."

Jesus is a "Deliverer" from sin, sickness, death, from social evils, the devil's communism and demoniacal socialism, from stinking society and putreous noblesse obligée, from Mammon's economy, from poverty and need, from Satanic imperialism and plutocratic democracies, from worship of self and money, from idolatry of titles, of honors and offices, from fetishism of luxury and high life, from dogmatic religions and the obeisance of shades and shadows. Jesus is a Deliverer from everything which does not belong to the Kingdom of the Heavens. Change mind, and the Deliverance will be sure!

Paul preached a deliverance from sin, a separation between man and sin, without the destruction of sin. Jesus preached deliverance from sin by destroying sin, "forgiveness of sin." The religion of Jesus was a religion of Light for "sons of Light", but sin and sickness and death, even the valley of the shadow of death, disappear before divine light, as shadows and darkness do before physical light. Where X-Rays cannot penetrate, the rays from the loving eye of Jesus pierce through, and opaque substance becomes light, like his Resurrection body, shining even as his Transfiguration body. For he is the Light which has come into the world to save, and darkness only cannot comprehend him, has to disappear, when he appears. Where ultra-violet rays fail to heal, a ray of divine light will cure every sore and wound of suffering humanity, when that humanity has changed mind and sought help from the healer and deliverer, whose name is Jesus of Nazareth.

The Joy-Bringer.

Jesus was and is a Joy-bringer. He was ever an optimist, never he despaired. How dark and impossible things looked to others, with him was always sunshine and joy. He, of all

men, was sunny and cheerful, for he could always say, "with God nothing is impossible." There was always cheer in his words, in his face, in his acts, even when he had to condemn sin and Phariseism. Therefore he could pray for his enemies, bless his persecutors, and intercede for his executioners, because he knew that one day evil would be wiped out, and deeds of frail human beings be judged in mercy by a loving Father who sends rain over both the just and the unjust.

Asceticism was foreign to the life of Jesus. He fasted once—for gaining self-control. For his disciples he prescribed a fast of Joy. He associated with the outcasts, the men and women of the street, with publicans and sinners. He was nicknamed "Gluttoner and Winebibber", a "Friend of Sinners", and he did not object to these titles, nor tried he to prove that these were untrue, since he and everybody else knew how true they were. He had "come to save that which was lost." He was a pure hedonist equipped with perfect self-control, surpassing an Aristippus or an Epicurus, because to him joy was divine.

His Gospel was a Gospel of Joy—hedonism pure and simple—and this he never forgot to proclaim. Before all it was a Gospel of Joy to The Poor who otherwise had no joy in life. And this program of Joy was proclaimed at his birth by the angel who announced to the shepherds, "I bring you the Gospel of great Joy which shall be to all the people" (Lk 2: 10). He dressed well, and never refused an invitation to a feast, and always had his disciples with him. He bade them to look upon the days of their companionship as days of a wedding feast: "Can ye make the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?" (Lk 5: 34). Thank God, the Bridegroom is with us still!

The Prodigal Son was denied the food of swine while he was in "the far country." But when "he came to himself" and decided to return home, his Father welcomed him with jewels, gorgeous raiments, and a great feast which included music, dancing, and merry-making, because "it was meet that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and has got Life; and was lost, and is found" (Lk 15:32).

These words are from the lips of Jesus. There was no sign of fasting, though the "elder" brother was somewhat envious. But the Father was still ruler of that house and had the last word in its affairs. Poor Jewry! Poor Rome, and Apes of Rome, who must fast! Will the prodigal sons ever return home?

Jesus is the real, the great joy-bringer. For he brings joy not only to the spirit of man, but to his soul and body as well. Nor does this joy consist in mere shoutings of Hallelujahs and the fingering on golden harps. No, the joys of the fellowship and the Brotherhood of Jesus Christ consist in "following" Jesus, in living our every-day life as he did, in eating and drinking and enjoying ourselves as he did. He enjoyed the wedding at Cana and the boys playing on the market places, and he has bidden us "to follow him." He enjoyed to sit down at meat with publicans and sinners, if his disciples were with him. He enjoyed to have Mary Magdalene anoint and kiss his feet, and he appreciated a quiet evening in Bethany.

Of course, he enjoyed work, too, even fatigue. He enjoyed to heal and to help, to preach and to teach, to pray and to "work with the Father", but he wanted to do it in the company of his disciples. The life of the Kingdom is a life of joy, because sin, sickness and death are unknown there.

This much, at least, is included in the name JESUS.

"In the Name."

A name denotes the representation of an identity. A name of a person represents the identity of that person. But a name may not only represent an identity, it may also express that identity, that is, it may express the nature and characteristics of that identity. That quality is also shared by Biblical names. In the Bible we also meet with expressions like "in the name of", "into the name of", "for his name's sake", "to know a name", "to name a name", and "the dwelling place of a name."

To know a name, or to name a name of a being, often means to have the power to control that being. When Jesus cast out the demons of the possessed man at Gadara, he

demanded to know their names(Mk 5:9), which caused consternation among the demons. When Jacob wrestled with the angel at Penueel, he could not prevail until he got his name(Gn 32:28—29).

To be baptized into the name of Jesus, or to believe into the name of Jesus, or to have faith into the name of Jesus or God indicates that change whereby a person assumes the responsibility of becoming a representative of Jesus or of God and to express him as truly as his name does. Therefore this change and the assumption of such a responsibility cannot be made in a haphazard or unconscious way, by means of a ceremony, or through a substitute, of whatever kind it may be, because it requires not only the consent but the determination of the baptized or believing person to surrender himself so fully that he can become a true, reliable, and real representative of Jesus, come as close to him, and reflect him as fully as his name does.

Paul's idea of faith was that a Christian becomes identical with Christ in such a way that he loses his own identity and nothing but Christ remains in him: "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ lives in me"(Gal 2:20). The Gospel idea, as Jesus presented this question, was that a disciple, entering into the name of Jesus by faith or works, comes so near to him, becomes so like unto him, expresses him so completely as the name Jesus does, and still remains an identity of his own. By believing in Jesus or in God, we do not lose ourselves, but gain our lives and begin in reality to live. It is a self-surrender, but only a surrender of man's lower self to assume the divine self which is found in Christ but belongs to us by birthright. This higher self is perfect, godlike, and of the same nature as the divinity of Christ, and we can enter into it through faith in Jesus Christ. But that requires an inner determination which no one else can perform in man's stead, because it presupposes the giving up of that man's lower self, which no one but self can do.

To pray in the name of Jesus means that a person has become a representative of Jesus at least while he prays.

This signifies that such a person uses his divine ego when he prays, because that ego is kin with the Son of God, and also that he lives and moves in the divine *pleroma*, or "fullness", the atmosphere of the Kingdom. Such a prayer will be heard, because he that prays stands arrayed before the throne of mercy with all the power and authority that Jesus had, and his prayer will have the same value and quality as if Jesus himself had prayed it. There is only one kind of sons of God, and only one kind of Christ spirit in the world which avails anything, namely The Spirit with which Jesus was anointed. There is no use to offer any other kind of prayer, because it will not and can not be heard.

Before a person starts to pray, let him make certain that he really prays *in the name of* Jesus, if he expects an answer to his prayer. Very few persons know how to pray in this manner. The disciples did not know it, and they came therefore to Jesus and asked, "Lord, teach us to pray earnestly" (Lk 11:1). Luke reports the only prayer to be said in public, as the answer of Jesus to this request. It is one of the secrets of the Kingdom to know how to pray. One thing is certain—prayer must be offered privately and "in His name." Faith may move mountains and prayer may open heavens now as in the time of Jesus, if we have learned to exercise these powers and received the divine authority and the anointing necessary for standing side by side with him who has power over All.

To bless in the name of Jesus is to represent Jesus as completely as his name does, and in that representative capacity, with his authority and power, to impart of the divine fullness to him who is to be blessed. This authority and power will extend as far as the authority and power of Jesus extends.

Faith, prayer and blessing are not effective on the order of mechanical performances, nor by magic art of professionals or ecclesiastics, but achieved only through personal union with deity itselfs.

The *Shekinah* was a place where Jahveh's "Name" was

to dwell (Dt 12:5), but Jahveh himself would chose the "place." In the New Covenant we are assured that "wherever two or three are gathered together *into My Name*, there I am in the midst of them"(Mt 18:20), but the condition is "into My Name", and nothing else can be substituted for it. Wherever that condition is met, the divine *Shekinah* will choose its "place", and that "Name" will operate with the same power and authority which the Son of Man once exercised and still exercises among his disciples.

CIRCUMCISION. Jesus was circumcised when he was eight days old (Lk 2:21a).

The story of the institution of the Jewish rite of circumcision is told in Gn 17:1-14. This story is compiled from two sources, one dealing with Abram and theophanies of Jahveh and God, the other dealing with Abraham and a theophany of god Shaddai. Since Abram lived about 2100 B.C., and Abraham about 1600 B.C., the two stories reflect social and religious customs of two ages as far apart as five hundred years. The older source was written in the Levitical (L) dialect known to us by the Priestly laws enacted at Mount Horeb, and the later source was written in the Aaronic (A) dialect known to us by the Priestly laws enacted at Mount Sinai.

Traces of a Jahvistic source written in the dialect of Judah (J), as well as traces of the Tholedoth Book (T), written in the Levitical dialect, are also to be found in this story.

L

A

17:1.(T) And Abram was ninety-nine years old,
(J) and Jahveh appeared unto Abram,

and he said unto him,

Walk before me, and be perfect.

I am god Shaddai.

2. And I will make a covenant between me and thee.

And I will make thee exceedingly great.

3. And Abram fell upon his face;

(L) And God spake with him, saying

4. I, behold, my covenant is with thee; 5. and thy name

And thou shalt become a father of a multitude of nations.

L

shall no more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham, because I have made thee a father of a multitude of nations.

8. And I shall

all the land of Canaan, and I shall become God for them.

9.(T) And God said unto Abraham,

11.(L) And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, which shall become a sign of covenant between me and you.

12.(T) A son of eight days shall be circumcised among you, (L) whether home-borne or bought for silver, as well as the son of the stranger which is not of thy seed.

14. And that soul whose flesh of his foreskin has not been circumcised, shall be cut off from his people.

Circumcision was the sign of a covenant by which God entered man and became his God and man thereby became divine, a people of God. "My covenant shall become in your 'flesh' an everlasting covenant"(Gn 17:13), and it is strongly emphasized that the "covenant shall become God to thee and thy seed after thee"(Gn 17:7), and in this passage the Greek version, which is the more reliable, puts it even stronger: "my covenant shall be thy God."

This rite grew up from an original idea of a sacrifice of the

A

6. And I will make thee exceedingly fruitful; and I will make thee into nations, and kings shall come out of thee.

7. And I shall establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee for their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to become God for thee and for thy seed after thee.

give to thee and to thy seed after thee the land of thy sojournings for an everlasting possession;

And thou shalt observe my covenant, thou and thy seed after thee for their generations.

10. This is my covenant, which thou shalt observe between me and you and thy seed after thee:

Circumcise every male among you;

13. The home-borne and the son bought with thy silver shall surely be circumcised, and my covenant shall in your flesh become an everlasting covenant.

If there be an uncircumcised male he has broken my covenant.

son. Instead of sacrificing the life of the son, a part of his flesh was made a substitute, which was offered to his God. This substitute was accepted by God, because there was a shedding of blood in this rite, which was acceptable to God, for "without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Hb 9: 22). In the blood shed was vitality, and vitality is a manifestation of eternal life of which God alone is dispenser, and by which he can come in touch with man. Through this rite God could therefore enter man and take up his dwelling in him, and at least one part of man had become holy, i. e., "set apart" for God. Circumcision was therefore regarded as a way whereby God could restore his union and communion with man after he had eaten of the "tree of knowing" (Gn 2: 17).

The sanctity of this rite depended upon the fact that Abraham, with whom God made this covenant, became through God's promise a "son of the divine promise." Circumcision was required of any one who wanted to join the Jewish assembly and partake in its divine promises. It was not necessary that a man was born a Jew, in order to become an heir to these promises. A proselyte, who had been circumcised, was as much an inheritor of God's promises, as a son of Abraham, or of David. "A son of a stranger", that is, any foreigner, as well as any slave bought from foreigners, must be circumcised, and became thereby an heir of Israel's divine promises. Circumcision was therefore the means by which man became a son of God.

The sign of this covenant became a perpetual reminder to man, that he had once lost his homestead rights in the Paradise, because of the sin of "eating of the tree of knowing", for nothing could be more apt to remind him of sins of unchastity than the sign of this covenant.

But we must not infer from this story that the rite of circumcision was first introduced by Abraham, or even by Abram. This story does not say so, nor is that a fact. We are only told that, by the sign of this rite, God and Abram made a covenant whereby God became Abram's God, and Abram became God's eternal property. But we are not told that Abram was the first man to introduce the rite of circumcision.

Circumcision was practiced in the world thousands of years before the time of Abram. The Egyptian monuments carry this rite back into the fifth millennium B.C. at least. Even their gods were circumcised, as was the case with at least Ammon of Thebes and the ancient god Man of Coptos, and this fact carries the rite back into the prehistoric age of Egypt.

God Man and the ancient inhabitants of Coptos, as well as the race of the pyramid builders which came from Coptos, were related to the old Cappadocians and the Colchians, who had come from regions south of Abyssinia and Somali land, in which regions circumcision was practiced in hoary antiquity. Since it was brought into Egypt with the race of the pyramid builders, it is safe to conclude, that it had its root in religion. Was it the sign of Cain, the ancient mastersmith and city-builder, mentioned in Gn 4:15, and of his descendants, the Kenites? Early myths and the latest discoveries in the field of Anthropology point to the regions south and east of the Caspian Sea as the cradle of culture. Both science and the Bible agree that smithcraft marks the beginning of real, higher culture. We know that this culture had spread at an early time into prehistoric Elam and Babylonia, and was thence transferred over the seas into other continents, notably Punt and Somali land. In any case, circumcision is a very ancient rite, and had spread in prehistoric times over a large area of the world, but always in company with a higher culture, like smithcraft and building. But culture presupposes religion.

Herodotus informs us that the Ethiopians, Colchians, Macronians, and some Syrians and Phoenicians practiced circumcision, though he is inclined to think that these have all learned it from Egypt (Herodotus II, 36, 37, 104). He regards it as a hoary custom with the Egyptians.

The ancient Arabs practiced circumcision and still do so. The rite is presupposed in the Koran. Christians of the Ethiopic and Coptic churches are still practicing circumcision together with the rite of baptism. The ancient Aztecs of Mexico practiced circumcision, and it is still practiced in central Australia and by several tribes along the Amazon.

On the other hand this rite was unknown among the Semites of Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, and Syria, except the Jews and tribes related to them. Nor was it practiced by the Philistines, nor in Asia Minor, or Greece.

Abram did therefore not carry this rite with him from Ur of Chaldea or from Haran of Mesopotamia. Nor was he the first to introduce it into Palestine, when he entered the highlands of Judah. He found it there in full bloom, and it had been there for a long time. Both he and Abraham, when they settled in this region, entered a sphere of culture that was strongly Egyptian, and circumcision was here the "custom of the land." It is but natural to expect, that they would be influenced by this custom and even adopt it.

That this was so, becomes still more clear in the case of Abraham. For it was god Shaddai (Gn 17:4), who introduced this rite to Abraham, and who offered to become his God, an offer which Abraham readily accepted. But Shaddai is identical with the Egyptian god Sati who was the protector of the rite of circumcision in the Egyptian religion, both in Egypt and in its provinces. This Sati is identical with the Hattite Satuh, the Roman Sat-urn, the Syrian Adar or Hadar, the Assyrian Adar, and the Nordic Hoed, the Haedkyn of the Beowulf story, the great smith, who, as the name in the Beowulf story shows, was none other than the great smith, the Cain of the Bible and the Kaiwan of the Mandaic religion. The hieroglyph for Sati indicates him plainly as the protector of the rite of circumcision, and the religion of Egypt verifies it. Abraham's change of religion was therefore also a change of god, in reality a change of divinity, though mostly only in name. Patriarchal religion reflects the common religion of that age, which was a worship of sex grown up from a ritual that marks man's first attempt seriously and effectually to confess that God is love, though he, even under patriarchal conditions, did not advance further than to affirm that love is (a) god.

To be sure, it was a primitive form of religion and scarcely intelligible to our age, but still it was an immense step upward and forward from the preceding religions of Animism and Totemism. It points to a tremendous evolution of the mind of man, because by this rite he recognized that divinity can dwell in man, and he had provided means by which God could enter him. The question is not one, why man should think, that this rite was the proper way for God to enter man, but one far more vital, namely, that human mind could realize that God could and would at all enter a human being to dwell in him. To Israel the covenant of circumcision marks such a marvelous step forward in human progress, that there can be no wonder why men of all ages and climes have singled out Abraham as "the father of Faith." For he, and the story of him, teach men that God can come in living union with man on whatever level of culture a man may stand.

But this rite soon lost its sacred character. Moses was not circumcised and had no special sympathy with this rite. On the contrary he pleaded, "Circumcise therefore the foreskins of your hearts" (Dt 10:16; 30:6). The reference to "bridegroom of blood" (Ex 4:25) dealt, in the original source, with Jahveh who was "touched" by Zipporah. The son of Zipporah was circumcised, but Moses, her husband, was not circumcised.

Jeremiah went even further. "Circumcise yourselves to Jahveh, and take away the foreskins of your hearts, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem: lest my fury go forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doing"(Jr 4: 4; cf. Jr 9: 25-26).

In the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah the rite of circumcision was emphasized with fanatical zeal, and though, during the Greek period, circumcision was often neglected and many men even tried to undo it by means of a new operation, as they became objects of jesting in the baths and on the arena by their Greek friends, the Maccabees and the Pharisees became fanatical zealots for this rite. In the time of Jesus the rite of circumcision had become the chief article of faith in Jewish theology, in spite of Moses and the Prophets.

Paul had been a staunch Pharisee and remained a fanatic to the end of his life. Contrary to the apostles he taught that "circumcision profits nothing"(Rom 3:1; 1 Cor 7:19; Gal 5:6; 6:15) and forbade it to Jew and Gentile believers alike for fear, that they thereby should come "under the law." It was an insane zeal on his part, for he roused thereby the entire Jewish world not only against himself, but against every follower of Jesus, because the Jews took for granted, that Paul's preaching was an article of faith with the Christians. This fanaticism went so far, that Paul finally expounded a curious theory or philosophy of his own, which he formulated so, that the Christians "were circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of flesh, in the circumcision of Christ"(Col 2:11). Thereby he still adhered to the idea of circumcision, though it must be spiritual, and added the fallacy, that Christ had been circumcised in behalf of all Christians who on that account did not need to undergo that operation. Of course, the Gospel says, that it was Jesus, not Christ, who was circumcised. And Paul never took pains to inform us how it could be possible for his spirit Christ to be circumcised. Presumably it had to be made in some manner like that, in which he defended baptism in behalf of the dead (1 Cor 15:29).

Neither Jesus nor his disciples antagonized the Jews on the question of circumcision—it was to them too simple to bother with seriously. That question would never have been raised, if Paul's obstinacy had not pressed it forth. When the storm broke loose at Antioch (Acts 15), over the question of circumcision, the disciples at Jerusalem had to take a decisive stand which, though beclouded by the author of the Acts in favor of

Paul, in reality became this—so far as we can study it from contemporary events—that Jewish children should be circumcised, but not Gentiles. That was already the usage. Mark never raised that question when he evangelized Egypt. Therefore the Coptic disciples continued to circumcise as before, though they were Gentiles. And John never raised this question at Ephesus, where there were both Jews and Gentiles. But Paul could never agree with either Mark or John, and that made the great difference between the work and the teaching of these men.

The assumption of some modern theologians that circumcision is a prototype of baptism lacks every foundation in Holy Scriptures, even if the Pauline doctrine of baptism be accepted. If the apostles had seen any relation between these rites, we may be quite sure that they would have been very quick in grasping that fact and using it as a most wonderful argument in favor of baptism. But there is not a shadow of such a thought in the New Testament. Jesus taught baptism as a symbol of "change of mind."

What position did Jesus take toward circumcision? He was himself circumcised, but was not responsible for that act. He never condemned that act nor that institution, because this question never appealed to him with such a force that he felt constrained to treat it in public. Only once he touched that subject, and from the attitude which he then took, we can infer that he regarded it solely from a sanitary viewpoint, and thus it might be tolerated. He had healed a man on a Sabbath, for which the Jews criticised him. His answer was, "If a man receive circumcision on the Sabbath, that the law of Moses may not be broken; are ye wroth with me, because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath?" (Jh 7:23).

The ethical side of this question was interpreted in two ways in New Testament times, which were sharply in contrast to one another. Paul claimed, "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwells no good thing" (Rom 7:18). The Gospel affirmed that "the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us" (Jh 1:14). Because of this, Jesus changed Patriarchal religion from "love is God" to "love is divine", for "God is love, and he that dwells in love dwells in God" (1 Jh 4:16), and the new commandment read, "Love one another, as I have loved you" (Jh 13:34).

But it was the religious aspect of this question that chiefly interested Jesus, and this he emphasized, time and again, though

only under the garb of symbols, the one affirming that his body was the Temple of God (Jh 2: 21), and in several parables dealing with the mysteries of the Kingdom.

NAZARENES. Tertullus told Felix that there was a sect, "The Nazarenes", of whom Paul was a ringleader (Acts 24:5). This was a false accusation in so far as it concerned Paul because it was he who called forth the name "Christians" and had little, if any, connection with the Nazarenes. This was originally ■ nick name handed out by the Jews of Judea to the followers of Jesus. From Nathanel's query, "What good can come from Nazareth?" (Jh 1: 46) we conclude that Nazareth was an ill-reputed place, and "Nazarenes" would therefore be a fitting name for this hated people. The name Nazareth was otherwise supposed to denote "the Carpenters' town". "Nazarenes" became, however, soon widely used; for Nazara, i. e. "Nazarenes", became the common oriental designation of the Christians, though originally the Nazarenes were the followers of Jesus, while "Christians" were those who had adopted Paul's Christology.

Epiphanius tells us, in his confused way, about a sect called "Nazarenes" who lived in his time (370 A.D.) in Coelo-Syria, Decapolis, and Basanitis, whither they had fled shortly before the fall of Jerusalem (70 A.D.) He claims that they were Jews who believed in both the old and the new covenant, in the resurrection of Jesus, and in one God and Jesus Christ His Son. That sounds like pretty good evidence for fellowship of Jesus. Jerome claims, however, that they were neither Jews nor Christians—a remarkably true statement from such ■ source, and well worth to remember. He adds that they believed in Jesus Christ, the son of the Virgin Mary, and accepted only the Gospel according to the Hebrews—which has been lost. The Nazarenes were identical with the Ebionites, the successors of "The Poor", for so were the disciples of Jesus called.

CHAPTER VI.

Birth of The Son of God.

When the forty days of Purification had been completed, as prescribed in the Law of Moses (Lv 12: 1—8), Joseph and Mary went to the Temple, bringing the child with them, to offer the Sacrifice of Purification, and to present Jesus to the Lord (Lk 2: 22—24), according to the Law of the Lord.

The Purification.

Modern Criticism is inclined to doubt the historicity of this narrative in Luke's Gospel. The objections deal chiefly with the statement that Joseph took part in this ceremony, which should only concern the mother, for none but the mother became "unclean" by the birth of a child.

The case of Mary is therefore clear. She had born a child, whereby blood had been shed, and that fact alone made a person *taboo*, "unclean." In cases of childbirth and leprosy, only a priest could purify the unclean. The Law prescribed that in cases of poverty (Lv 12: 8) a sacrifice of a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons were sufficient for this sacrifice of Purification. That became Mary's sacrifice, because she and her husband were poor.

Joseph's case can also be explained. He, as well as everybody else, had always reason to visit the Temple, because according to their belief, that was the place where men met God. And man needs always to meet God, and can never meet him too often. It was not only at the three great annual feasts that people "went up" to Jerusalem. There was always a surging mass of people in the court of the Temple, because there are always some men who, for one reason or another, need to meet his Creator, to confess a sin, to expiate a crime, or to pray. Furthermore the Temple was the central place for the family reunions, for the Thank Offerings and the Peace Offerings were nothing but family reunions, celebrated "be-

fore the Lord" in his Court. Nothing can be more fitting than that celebrations of joy take place before God, or that those who are near and dear meet "before the Lord."

It is not stated that Joseph offered a personal sacrifice at this occasion. But what, if he had to offer a sacrifice for sin. He was not better than other men. How often do not men need to make a Sin Offering? Such a sacrifice consisted also of a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons (Lv 5:7).

Finally, Joseph and Mary were now to return to their home in Nazareth. Jerusalem lay on their way home, and it was but natural that the father accompanied his wife on this occasion.

The Sacrifice of the Firstborn.

But Jesus was the firstborn and had to be presented to the Lord: "Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever opens the womb among the sons of Israel, both of men and of beasts: it is mine" (Ex 13:2; cf. Ex 22:29; 34:19; Nu 3:13; 8:17). That was the command of the Lord. He had slain the firstborn in Egypt, and demanded the firstborn of Israel as his reward. None but the father could offer this sacrifice. Joseph had therefore to visit the Temple this time.

The custom of offering the firstborn was older, however, than the time of the Exodus. Abraham was ordered to offer his firstborn (Gn 22:2) on mount Moriah, though this hoary custom was now changed, because Jahveh declared that a substitute would be acceptable.

The ceremony of the sanctification of the firstborn was, however, not a reminiscence of the sacrifice of the firstborn, but of a dedication of the oldest son to God that he might be the priest of the family.

Each family in ancient society must have a priest and a vestal virgin. At the time, when the family constituted the community, and no community sanctuary existed, each family must have its own priest. The family was both the social and the religious unit. The father could not perform this office. It was the age of the Matriarchate, when the mother governed

family and clan, and the father had to live away, most of the time, from the tent, either to watch the herd, go on hunting trips, or to undertake predatory raids, for the support of his family. In reality, fatherhood amounted to very little at this time. It was the mother and the firstborn son, Laban, who carried out the transaction, when Rebecca was given in marriage. Bethuel, the father, was merely a silent looker-on.

The father could not be the priest of the matriarchal family or clan. It was the firstborn son who was *sanctified*, "set apart", for this service of the family *teraphim*, the *lares* and *penates* of the tent, and of the worship of the Ancestors. And it was most fitting that it was the firstborn son who filled this office in the family or clan. He was the link between the past and the future, the interpreter of the will of the ancestor divinities, the recorder or custodian of the family traditions, and the defender of the acts of his family before the spirits of the fathers, who continually were guarding and furthering the prosperity of their descendants, the sons and daughters of the family and clan.

The same was the case with the oldest daughter of the family. The fire on the family hearth was sacred, because it was a difficult thing to rekindle it, if it went out. The mother had charge of the tent and could not find time to look after the fire. Therefore the daughter was "set apart" to guard the fire, and out of this primitive custom arose the institution of the Vestal Virgins, one of the most sacred institutions of the ancient world.

Jesus was brought to the Temple to be "set apart" for this very purpose, though the priestly office had been given to the tribe of Levi and the House of Aaron, who had been substituted for the Firstborn of Israel. That was so because this tribe of Levi was not able to support itself in any other way, ever since it made the heinous raid on Sichem (Gn 34), when it was almost wiped out. In spite of this substitute—and substitutes are always awkward things—the ancient custom of dedicating the firstborn to the Lord was kept alive. The firstborn was looked upon as the hope of the family and its representative before

the ancestral spirits. Jesus was dedicated to fill this office, to be the family priest of the House of Joseph, and to become the Mediator between the living and the departed members of that family.

The Manifestation of The Son of God.

Such was the intention and the meaning of this "sanctification", and the proper ceremony prescribed for dedications of this kind was carried out. But before that act was completed, another awe-inspiring, quite extraordinary act took place. Holy Spirit was present and acting in the Temple as never before, and the "pious", the "true Israel", was brought there in haste to witness this act, which took place just as the parents were bringing the child into the Temple. Simeon and Hannah were brought thither, both of them aged, and both of them "looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Lk 2:38). Apparently they were looking for a Prince, the Son of the King, who was to redeem Jerusalem from the power of Rome. And, indeed, that Prince came.

Simeon took the child in his arms, and "blessed God", because "it had been revealed to him by Holy Spirit, that he should not see death, before he had seen Jahveh's Anointed" (Lk 2:26). The son of Mary became then and there "an Anointed of the Lord", and it is he whom Simeon sees, when he received the child in his arms, blessed God for it, and sang his immortal *Nunc Dimittis*:

"O Lord, let now thy servant depart,
In the presence of thy Word—in Peace,
Because mine eyes have seen thy Salvation,
Which thou hast made ready before the face of
all people:

Light to be revealed to the Gentiles
And Glory to thy people Israel" (Lk 2:29-32).

What was it that Simeon and Hannah saw? Why did Simeon string his harp to Johannine music? This child had suddenly become "Salvation", that is, "Saviour", the "Word", "Peace", "Light", "Glory", in the presence of which Simeon

was standing, and which had just then "been made ready", "manifested."

This great, extraordinary event meant, in the words of Simeon, that the Prince, the Son of the King, who was to redeem Jerusalem, had been manifested, "born", in the Temple of the Lord at the time when the son of Mary was being dedicated to the Lord. Simeon saw it, Hannah saw it, and the parents "marveled."

At the Conception it was the "Word" which was given to Mary and accepted by her. Nothing was said of the birth of this Word at the birth of Jesus.

It was fitting that Jesus, "the son of David", should be born in Bethlehem-Ephrathah, "the city of David." It was still more fitting that the Son of God Most High should be born and manifested in the House of God. No other place was really fit for that birth. The homage paid by Simeon and Hannah in the name of God's Israel was a homage to the Son of God, who was manifested at that hour in God's Temple.

When Simeon had "blessed God" for the birth of the Son of God, he turned to Joseph and Mary and "blessed them" for the birth of the Son of Man. He made a sharp distinction between these two realities.

The Mystery of the Resurrection.

Luke adds an address, seemingly directed by Simeon to Mary, but so peculiar in diction, that its interpretation has become a stumblingblock to many. "Behold, this one is set for a fall and a resurrection of many in Israel, and for a contradicted sign; yea and a sword shall pierce through thy own soul, that thoughts of many hearts may be revealed" (Lk 2: 34-35). No one can say that this is easy to understand, and it becomes still more difficult to understand it, when it is translated literally, and on that depends its meaning and interpretation: "Behold, this one *lies into* a fall and a resurrection of many in Israel, and *into* a contradicted sign."

All that we can say is, that the language is mystic, profoundly so, and mystic are the references to "fall", "resurrec-

tion", "sign", and "sword." We venture to suggest that this passage has been taken from a "Mystery of the Resurrection", in which "Simeon" and "son and mother" were the principal figures.

The Childhood of Jesus.

The childhood of Jesus was spent at Nazareth. Luke describes it in the following words: "And the child grew, and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him" (Lk 2:40). "Grace of God" denotes divine substance, the manifestation of the divine nature as imparted into man. Luke uses this expression to describe how the divine Sonship was gradually unfolding itself, until Jesus became conscious of, that he was The Son of God.

This unfolding of his divine nature progressed until his divine self became lord of his mental self. According to Luke's view, this took place when Jesus visited the Temple at the age of twelve. Here The Son of God had been manifested or born in Jesus, and here he took supremacy over him, so that Jesus became conscious of, that he was The Son of the Father. The Son of God, "tabernacling in flesh", told his earthly mother that he was "in the things of his Father", that the Temple was his rightful home, and that he from this time was going to recognize only God as his Father. This consciousness came henceforth to shape his life, his thoughts, his words, and deeds. He went with his parents to Nazareth and "became subject to them." That was all. He obeyed them, submitted to them during the short period he stayed in Nazareth, until he left their home to learn his craft. But though he was "subject" to his parents, he knew that God was his Father. To him he was not merely "subject"—he loved him.

No greater contribution to religion has ever been made than the declaration by Jesus that God was his Father. Through him man has learned that God is Father, that it is possible for God to become the Father of men, and for men to become sons of God.

If Jesus became conscious of his divine Sonship at the age

of twelve and asserted it, it may be proper to ask, Why did he not at once take up his Messianic call? Our answer is this: By the birth of The Son of God in him, Jesus became a "Lord's Anointed" only so far, that divine "power" was vested in him. But in order to exercise this gift, he must also receive "authority", the commission to use this power. Such an authority had as yet not been given to him. He was the "Prince", with the right of succession and inheritance, but he was not yet the "King", with the right to take the reins of government into his hands. The Prince had to learn to rule, before authority to rule would be given to him.

The Twelve Years.

Jesus became conscious of his divine Sonship at the age of twelve. We do not doubt this statement. But this, like most statements of and about Jesus, is capable of more than one interpretation. The divine Sonship was unfolding itself in Jesus during twelve years. But this number has also both an astrological and a mystical meaning. There are twelve signs of the Zodiac, through which the sun is continually moving. Each year has twelve months, making 365 days. Enoch lived 365 Years: thereafter "he walked with the Gods." He was therefore regarded as a sun. The followers of Basilides called Jesus *Abrahas*, because the letters of this name have the numerical value of 365. The Son of God is the true Sun of Righteousness. Thus Jesus had to spend 365 days in each sign of the Zodiac, before he could become conscious of the "fullness", *pleroma*, of The Son of God.

THE PARADISE STORY purports to tell man's first progress in culture. It is not a creation story, because man exists already, and the "forming" of man denotes a "transformation", a rise in culture.

God planted a garden where man was to live and enjoy its produce. But man failed to live up to the regulations imposed upon him, and was therefore driven out of this garden.

Apparently this story meant to show that man's first enterprise lay in the field of horticulture. Though he failed in that, the curse pronounced upon him for that failure was turned into

■ blessing, because he had to make a living and became an agriculturist. That was also his true destiny, even if he had to earn his bread "in the sweat of his face." Thus this story marks the transition from jungle life to agriculture.

But culture means religion, and back of the Story of the Garden lies a story of primitive religion, the origin of Animism, and the worship of holy trees and holy springs and rivers.

The sin that caused the "fall" of this man was "eating the fruit of the tree of good and evil knowing", and the word used to denote "knowing", *daath*, is related to that used in Gn 4:1, "Adam knew Eve his wife" (cf. Gn 4:17, 25). It was a sin of sex, which is here pictured as the curse of man. In order to emphasize this the "serpent" is introduced as the guile tempter of man. The story begins as a lovely idyl, singing the praises of primitive life, and ends in tragic gloom.

Modern criticism of the Bible regards this story as a literary unit and a part of the J Document. In both statements it is mistaken. Instead of one, there are two sources woven together most skillfully in this story, and neither of these sources belongs to the so-called J Document. By studying the Greek Version of the Bible, it appears that there was a JE source which was frequently used in the compilation of the first part of the Book of Genesis. This document had a vocabulary of its own, as well as other documentary marks, and to this document belongs one of the sources of the Paradise Story. It uses the divine name *Jahveh Elohim*. The other source uses the name *Elohim*, but betrays in other respects no relation with the P and E documents.

The evidence for two sources is found in the use of two different names to denote God, in the presentation of two different gardens, two means of irrigating these gardens, two kinds of clothing provided for man, mention of two kinds of food for man, two formulas of judgment, two formulas for driving out man from the garden, two distinct vocabularies with set phrases and idiomatic expressions, and two distinct and complete stories, as will appear below.

The earlier source deals with a garden located near a holy spring and knows only of one holy tree. In this source God is called *Elohim*, and the judgment takes place near the holy spring. We venture to identify this garden with the region around the ancient, sacred "Fountain of Judgment" at Kadesh Barnea, "the Sanctuary of the Great Spring", in the wilderness south of Judah. It bears all the marks of a prehistoric civiliza-

tion, and was always revered for its sanctity. The name "Fountain of Judgment" indicates it as an ancient seat of justice.

The second source deals with a "garden of Eden" in Babylonia, near the confluence of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. In reality it is a story of the founding of the city of Erech. The man of this garden has a name, Adam, and as pictured here he is the counterpart of the Babylonian hero Ea-Bani, or more correctly Ae-da(m), whose home was also at Erech. This "Man" is designated as a "clay" or "dust", apha, more correctly "gypsum", that is, he was regarded as a "Titan" (a name derived from the Greek titan(os), "gypsum"). Adam was "seized", kidnapped, from the land of Adamah and placed in this garden, which had two holy trees, one of which was the "Tree of Life." But the ancient name of the city of Babylon was Din-Tir, "Tree of Life." Some Babylonian raid into Edom in ancient time lies behind this story. At any rate, it means to say, that culture came into Babylonia from the West, particularly from the land of Adamah and Kedem.

The land of Adamah where this man was "formed" and to which he was returned after the expulsion from the garden, formed the northern part of Edom, south and east of the Dead Sea, a land which also in other passages of the Old Testament is known as the land of Adamah or Admah.

The first source is written in a dialect related to that of Benjamin. But since it deals with Kedem, and the garden probably was located at Kadesh, and the initial letter of both of these names is Q in the original, we shall designate this source with the sign Q.

The second source we designate with the letters JE, because this source uses Jahveh Elohim for its divine name. This compound name we render with "Lord of the Gods", because a polytheistic sense underlies it (Gn 2:18; 3:5, 22).

Traces of a third source appear at the beginning of the Paradise Story. Only the superscription of it remains, and this shows that it had belonged to the old Chronological work known as the "Tholedoth Book", and had been written in the dialect of Levi. It is a pity that this work was crowded out by the compiler and thus perished from the annals of men, because it evidently gave the history of the man whose "creation" is told in Gn 1:27. Apparently it had differed so fundamentally from the Paradise Story, that it could neither be compiled into it, nor even combined with it.

(T) *This is the Book of the Generations of the Heavens and the earth, when they were created.*

Q

Gn 2:5. No shrubbery of the field was as yet in the land, nor had a herb of the field as yet sprouted forth, because God had not caused to rain upon the land. But a fountain arose out of the earth and irrigated the whole surface of Adamah.

Then God formed the Man, a clay from Adamah, by breathing into his nostrils a breath of lives, so that he became a living soul.

Thereupon God planted a garden off Kedem, and there he placed the man whom he had formed. Furthermore, God caused to sprout forth from the ground all kinds of trees pleasant to behold, and in the midst of the garden the tree of knowing. Then God said to the man:

"From (the fruit of) the tree (which is in the midst of the garden), thou shalt not eat (nor even touch it, lest thou die").

JE

When the Lord of the Gods made the heavens and the earth, there was not a man to till the ground.

Now the Lord of the Gods (had) a garden in Eden (with) all kinds of trees good for food, also the tree of lives, and the tree of good and evil knowing.

And a river was going out of Eden to irrigate the garden, and thence it was divided and became four sources. The name of the first was Pishon: that is the one going around the whole land of the Havilah, where is gold—and the gold of that land is fine—; there is the chrysolite and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river was Gihon: that is the one going around the whole land of Cush. And the name of the third was Tigris: that is the one going east of Assur. And the fourth river was the Euphrates.

And the Lord of the Gods seized Adam and settled him in the garden of Eden, to till it and guard it.

And the Lord of the Gods charged Adam:

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest eat for food,

Except of the tree of good and evil knowing:

Of that thou shalt not eat at all."

Q

And again God formed from Adamah all kinds of beasts of the field, and all kinds of fowl of the heavens, and he brought (them) unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called a living soul, that became its name.

Thereupon God caused a trance to fall upon the man so that he fell asleep; and he took one of his halves and closed up the flesh instead of it. Then God built up the half, which he had taken from the man, into a woman and brought her unto the man. Then the man exclaimed:

"This is indeed bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman."

Now both of them were naked: still they did not feel ashamed.

But the serpent said unto the woman:

"How is it? Has God said, 'Ye shall not eat of all the trees of the garden'?"

And the woman said unto the serpent:

"From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat:

But from the fruit of the tree Which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, 'Ye shall not eat of it, nor even touch it, lest ye die.'"

Then the serpent retorted unto the woman:

"Ye will not die by death!

JE

Then the Lord of the Gods ordered:

"It is not good that Adam is alone:

We shall make him a helpmate,

A counterpart of his."

While Adam was calling to all the cattles of the field, and to all the fowl of the heavens, and to all the beasts of the field, still there was not found for Adam a helpmate, a counterpart of his.

(But the Lord of the Gods gave) to Adam a woman (to be with him). 4:1, Then she exclaimed:

"I have received a husband from the Gods!"

3:1, Now the serpent was the craftiest of all the beasts of the field, which the Lord of the Gods had made, and he said to the woman:

"If ye eat of it,

Ye will become like the Gods,

Knowing good and evil.

Q

Because the Gods are knowing that your eyes will be opened."

And the woman saw that the tree was a charm to the eyes to look upon, and apt to give understanding: wherefore she took of its fruit, and she ate, and she gave to her husband. And the eyes of both of them were opened, and they understood that they were naked.

Then God called unto him:

"Where art thou?"

And he answered:

"I became afraid, because I am naked."

And he said

"Who has told thee that thou art naked?"

And the man answered:

"The woman!"

Then God said (unto her):

"What is that?"

And she replied:

"The serpent!"

Then God said unto the serpent:

"Upon thy belly thou shalt walk,

And dust thou shalt eat

All the days of thy life."

JE

And the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and she seized (of it), and she gave also to her husband with her, and they ate.

Then they heard the voice of the Lord of the Gods, who was walking in the garden in the afternoon. And Adam and his wife hid themselves within a tree of the garden.

But the Lord of the Gods said:

"Where art thou?"

And he answered:

"Thy voice I heard in the garden:

Therefore I hid myself."

And he said:

"Hast thou eaten of the tree, Of which I charged thee:

'Do not eat of it?'"

And Adam answered:

"The woman which thou gavest with me,

She gave me of the tree, and I ate."

And the Lord of the Gods said to the woman:

"What hast thou done?"

And the woman replied:

"The serpent beguiled me: And I ate."

Then the Lord of the Gods said to the serpent:

"Because thou hast done this, Cursed be thou more than all the cattle,

And more than all the beasts of the field.

And I shall put enmity

Between thee and the woman,

Q

Unto the woman he said:

"I shall greatly increase

Thy pain and thy conception."

And (un)to the man he said:

"Because thou hast listened

To the voice of thy wife,
And hast eaten (of the fruit)
of the tree,

(of which) I said,
"Thou shalt not eat of it":

In pain thou shalt eat of the
Adamah

All the days of thy life.

Thorns and thistles shall it
sprout forth to thee,

And thou shalt eat the herbs
of the field."

Then he drove forth the man
and settled him in Kedem.

JE

And between thy seed and
her seed:

He shall seek for thy head,
And thou shalt seek for his
heel."

To the woman he said:

"In pain thou shalt bear
children:

Still thy desire shall be unto
thy husband,

And he shall rule over thee."

And to Adam he said:

"Because thou hast eaten of
the tree,

Which I forbade thee:

Cursed be the ground,

When thou tillest it.

In the sweat of thy face

Thou shalt eat bread,

Until thou returnest to Ada-
mah, for from it thou wast
seized."

And Adam called the name
of his wife Eve. And the Lord
of Gods made garments of skin
for Adam and his wife, and
clothed them.

Thereupon the Lord of the
Gods ordered:

"Lo, Adam has become like
one of us,

Knowing good and evil.

Now, lest he stretch forth
his hand,

And also seize of the tree of
lives,

And eat, and live for an
age. . . ."

Therefore the Lord of the
Gods sent him away from the
garden of Eden to till Adamah,
whence he had been seized.

CHAPTER VII.

Birth of The Messiah.

The call of Abram was a promise made by God to the Patriarch of building up a family and a nation, of which Abram was to be the founder and in which all nations of the earth were to be blessed and to reach utmost happiness: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy clan, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee; and I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and be thou a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curses thee will I curse: for in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed"(Gn 12: 1-3). This promise held forth the establishment of a "blessed" nation on earth, a state of real happiness, which later on was to be known as the Kingdom.

The same promise was repeated to the succeeding Patriarchs and upon this principle Jacob built the federation of Israel, a confederacy of a number of raiding, roving, and predatory bands from Mesopotamia and Syria, who were known in the Amarna age as *Hebrews*, "robbers", but were amalgamated by Moses under the name "Sons of Israel", and were partly settled in the land of Canaan in the time of Joshua. The Covenant of Horeb was a perpetuation of the promise to the Patriarchs, and remained the same, even when large bodies of Hattites and Amorites were fused with these heterogenous hordes of the Sons of Israel.

David and Solomon succeeded in joining these diverse elements, under the caption of "tribes", into a political unit around a central sanctuary at Jerusalem. They hoped, of course, that the Patriarchal promise would be realized in their kingdom. But after two generations their union fell apart into two states, even though their kings reigned "by the grace of God."

Messianic Expectations.

The Davidic kingdom remained ever the ideal upon which the Pious built their expectations of the future Messianic Kingdom, not because the kingdom of David was anywhere perfect, but because it had united Israel, given a certain degree of happiness to the people, and contained rudimentary possibilities for developing the Messianic Kingdom of peace and prosperity.

The prophets appeared, announcing a future kingdom and a king, "an anointed", who was to occupy "his father David's throne." But the Northern kingdom fell in 722, B.C., and its people were carried into captivity, never more to return to Israel. In 597, B.C., the Southern kingdom and its people were carried away captive into Babylonia. More prophets arose, holding forth the promise of a new, "Blessed" kingdom which was to be established by a Messiah, "an Anointed Holy One." A few of the captives in Babylonia returned in 536 and 458, B.C. To them Cyrus, King of Persia, was the Messiah (Is 45:1). But Cyrus died in 530, B.C., and the Jews remained mere vassals of Persia.

Alexander the Great came, overthrew Persia, and made Palestine a part of his empire. A new type of prophets, successors of Daniel, arose and visions of "the everlasting Kingdom" were seen. The Maccabees started one revolt after another against the Greek government of the Seleucids in the hope that they might inaugurate the new Kingdom. But these hopes were frustrated by the Roman occupation of Palestine, which finally culminated in the establishment of the hated and cruel Herodian dynasty, the archenemy of Judah, in Jerusalem.

But in spite of these reverses and the gloomy outlook, there lingered a little flame of hope and expectation in the hearts of the "Pious" of Israel, who were waiting for the redemption of the people of God. This flame grew brighter from day to day, nourished by the Apocalyptic literature which had appeared in the fourth century, B.C., and became voluminous in the first century, A.D.

"The Kingdom is drawing nigh", became the cry of the day, and saintly men and women were shading their eyes, looking for the advent of this blessed day. This expectation took more and more tangible form. The Kingdom was drawing nigh and was to be established by Messiah, the "anointed" Lord who was to be of the seed of David and to sit upon his throne. Some seers, like the authors of the Prophecies of Daniel and of the Secrets of Enoch, were even able to give the outlines, though faint, of the Kingdom, which was to be a Heavenly Kingdom established on earth, and Messiah was to be its founder and King. True, the delineations of the Messiah were still too delicate and obscure in the minds of these seers to give a concrete description of him, but he had to be divine, since his Kingdom was divine.

In the meantime the iron hand of Rome was pressing Jew and Gentile alike in its clutches. As the burdens of Rome and the Herodian yoke fell heavier and heavier upon the faithful of Israel, the hopes and the cries of the Pious rose mightier and mightier before the Throne of Mercy in impelling supplications: "How long, O Lord, until daybreak?"

Then daybreak came.

John The Baptist.

The winepresses of Gilead, of Basan and Gad were working overtime, people, busier than bees, were harvesting their products, and caravan after caravan was moving southward along the eastern shore of the Jordan. Plaintive songs from the caravans were re-echoed from the mountains and joined by men in the winepresses and on the fields. The autumn was in approach, the autumn of the year 28, A.D. (Lk 3:1).

The Day of Atonement was drawing nigh. Every faithful Jew wanted to be in Jerusalem that day, the tenth day of Tishri (about our first of October). He had been there last year and cried his "Next year in Jerusalem!" as he had cried year after year. There were so many sins to atone, so many bruised hearts to heal, so many forlorn hopes to be awakened and refreshed. "Next year in Jerusalem!" *He* might be there

then, *He* who is to redeem Israel, *He* the Messiah. Yea, *He will* come, the Prince of Peace, if only the sins be atoned—and the caravans kept on moving toward Jerusalem for the Day of Atonement.

They were coming closer and closer to the dreadful Dead Sea and the place where caravans crossed the Jordan to start the ascent to Jerusalem. Yonder in the Wilderness, where nature itself was preaching its somber lessons on sins of apostasy and of strange gods, the travelers saw a man clothed in a raiment of camel's hair, with a leathern girdle around his loins. The Wilderness around him had become a mass of breathless humanity, hanging upon his words; for he was preaching, and his words came rolling like thunder over the plain and reached the caravaneers. They stopped and listened. "Change mind, that your sins may be remitted, for the Kingdom is drawing nigh!"

"Is *He* come?" some one asked, suppressing a sigh. "Change mind!" it thundered again over the Wilderness from the man of the weird look. The caravaneers beat their breasts, as the caravan started, turning westward. "What a lesson on Atonement!" whispered a gray-haired man, as he wiped away a hot tear rolling down over his face.

The name of the preacher was Johannan ben Zacharijah. In our days he is known as John the Baptist.

Poor Johannan! "The Word of God had come upon him and sent him to preach in the Wilderness" (Lk 3:2). And he had forgotten to organize a Missionary Society that could at least provide him with a decent Clergyman's suit. How he looked! How he lived! Lived on locusts and wild honey! That was all which this wilderness produced. Why did he not start a few churches? The collections might have sufficed for hard tacks and dry beef. How inexperienced! No posters along the caravan road on "The Great Evangelist!" and no calling cards at all. Lost opportunities and no calls on society ladies and millionaires! What a miserable training!

"Change mind!" it roared over the prairies yonder the Jordan and his words came rolling back from Judea and Jeru-

salem. It looked as if he needed neither posters nor calling cards. A greater Day of Atonement was celebrated that year beyond the Jordan than in Jerusalem. John did not need to call on the people with a nice invitation card—they came to him. Never mind his awkward *habit*! John's work can be done without silk cassocks.

"And there went out unto him all Judea, and all they of Jerusalem" (Mk 1:5). The ancestors of our modern hypocrites were in the vanguard—well, a delegation of inquirers came first, sent by the Pharisees. How could the Pharisees dare to risk a visit with this preacher? John might not be orthodox. Had he been converted? Go slow, Pharisees! And be careful! But they were worried.

The delegation of inquiry arrived:

"Art thou the Messiah?"

"I am not."

"Art thou Elijah?"

"I am not."

"Art thou the Prophet?"

"I am not."

"Who art thou? What sayest thou of thyself? that we may give an answer to them that have sent us."

"I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the Way for the Lord."

Society came, and John thundered: "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" (Lk 3:7). God was no longer satisfied with mere "sons of Abraham", our good, nice Church people. John declared that God could raise such Christians from the stones around the Dead Sea, from the ruins of Sodoma and Gomorrah. No, God wanted more than that. What God wanted then and what he wants today is something more, something better than "sons of Abraham." He wanted then and he wants today sons of God, "men who bring forth fruits worthy of change of mind." Be careful, "the axe is already laid to the root of the tree." The old genealogical tree of Abraham might be hewn down and split into kindling wood, for "the Kingdom is drawing nigh", and

He is coming to baptize in Holy Spirit and *fire*. "Change mind!"

The money men and the Millionaires came—they were called Publicans in those days—"and they said unto him, Teacher, what must *we* do?" "And he said unto them, Extort no more than that which is appointed you." Keep your money, please, but change mind, O ye worshippers of Mammon!

"But soldiers on service also asked him, saying, And we—what must *we* do? And he said unto them, Do violence unto *no man*." John had no Church militant to win recruits for, nor had he started to take up subscriptions "for Jesus' sake" for military training and military academies.

Look at him once more, ye men who claim Church and Christianity. Who is like him today? Is it not time to change mind? The Kingdom is drawing nigh. Then listen to him! What did he mean with "Change of mind?" Our Bible Versions render it with "repentance." What has been substituted for it? Our modern "evangelists" have changed it into "stretch up your hands, all ye that have been saved to-night."

What a miserable caricature of "change of mind" are these modern revivals, conversions, retreats, missions!" Have they really changed mind?

Change of Mind.

A change of mind is a replacing of sinful mind with divine mind, and that cannot be created by means of conversions, revivals, or missions, but by man himself, and he has to put it on, the image of God, which is his eternal identity, his real self which he has possessed, though never made use of. That was the religion of Jesus, which was heralded by John.

Every man has two egos, and that means that he also has two minds, one mental and one divine, though only one of these may be in operation. "Change of mind" is the act of acknowledging the divine mind as ruler of man's personality.

By John's baptism nothing new was brought to man. The

change of mind consisted entirely of inner changes within man, wherefore this baptism was a seal, an acknowledgment, of a change of mind.

Remission of Sin.

This brings remission of sin, not because of any virtue in this baptism which, from the viewpoint of time, follows this change of mind, but because of the change itself within man, when the mind which sins is set aside, and a new mind begins to rule in man, a mind that cannot sin, and does not sin.

When this change takes place, sin disappears by itself, because in reality sin is a shadow, how terrible it may ever appear, and it will appear terrible until it disappears. This shadow has to disappear, when divine light falls upon man, and the divine mind in man partakes of this divine spiritual light.

"Remission of sin" is the disappearance of sin from man, and takes place in the same way as shadows and darkness disappear before light. The Son of God calls himself therefore the "Light of the World", and shines in the world "for the remission of sins."

The Baptism of Jesus.

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized by John into the Jordan. And straightway coming out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder, and The Spirit as a dove descending upon him; and a voice came out of the heavens: Thou art my Son, the beloved: in thee I am well pleased"(Mk 1: 9-11).

John's baptism was a seal of the change of mind. It is not stated, that a change of mind had taken place in Jesus at his baptism. On the contrary, John had already testified, "There comes after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose sandals I am not sufficient to stoop down and loose. I baptize you in water, but he shall baptize you in Holy Spirit"(Mk 1: 7-8). The baptism of Jesus was therefore not a seal of a change of mind, because that change of mind had already taken place, and his divine mind had for a long time been in control of his personality. According to the state-

ments of the Gospels, the baptism of Jesus differed from other baptisms performed by John in this respect, that it became a preparation for receiving "The Spirit."

The Spirit.

As Jesus arose out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder and The Spirit descending upon him. It had a bodily form, like a dove (Lk 3:22). It remained with and abode upon him. This fact is especially emphasized in the Gospel of John. And John the Baptist bare witness: "I beheld The Spirit descending out of heaven; and it abode upon him" (Jh 1:34). Jesus was "The Son of God" by birth. He became at the baptism "the beloved Son" in whom God was well pleased. Something new came to him at the baptism, something which is called "The Spirit" in the Gospel of Mark and John, our most trustworthy sources.

What is meant by The Spirit? It must have been something well known to the Baptist, something which he did not need to define more precisely, and therefore was also well known to others, especially to his hearers and disciples. Apparently he had expected that this Spirit should come, since he had begun to "make straight the Way for the Lord." "The Spirit" was then, in John's language the same as the Messiah, for whom he and Israel were waiting. John designated the Messiah as The Spirit.

The word "spirit", *pneuma*, occurs in the Gospels in four different forms: 1. Spirit; 2. The Spirit; 3. Holy Spirit; and 4. The Holy Spirit. The first form, "Spirit", denotes either something "spiritual", or a good or evil spirit, or breath, or principle of life. The third and fourth forms, "Holy Spirit" and "The Holy Spirit", seem to denote the same idea, the female principle of the Immanence of God. The second form, "The Spirit", is used only in particular expressions and always in a way that it plainly indicates the "Christ-Spirit." In no case is the term "The Spirit" identical with Holy Spirit, nor does it denote simply "Spirit", or "principle of life."

It is true that in the Gospel of Luke this Spirit is called

"the Holy Spirit"(Lk 3:22), and in the Gospel of Matthew "the Spirit of God"(Mt 3:16). But these passages come from late "doctrinal" sources, when Truth was being modified to fit Theology, especially that of Paul, and the Christ-Spirit became the "Spirit of Christ"(Rom 8:9; Phil 1:19; I Pet 1:11), that is, Christ had become a manifested personality with a Spirit of his own. In the Subapostolic Age the original distinction between The Spirit and Holy Spirit seems entirely lost. It is therefore the more important for us to keep clear the original distinction made in the Gospels of the eyewitnesses.

Anointed.

Messiah is a Hebrew word which means "anointed." *Christ* is a Greek word, *christos*, which also means "anointed."

In the Old Testament age certain men, and classes of men, were set apart by "anointing", whereby they became invested with a certain office. Kings, priests, and prophets were the three common classes of "anointed" officers. Through the "anointing" a certain "authority" was conferred upon such a person, because it was believed that a certain "spirit" was conferred with the anointing and was "confirmed" or bound to abide in the anointed person by means of the anointing oil.

Oil was looked upon as an elixir of life, and the Olive tree was always sacred to some divinity. It was sacred to the "virgin" Athene in Greece, and that faith had come with Athene to Greece from Egypt. Neith of Sais was the Egyptian prototype of Athene, and her feast was called the "Lighting of Lamps." A sacred oil, prepared from Olive oil and salt and perfumes, was used in these lamps.

Upon the supposed sanctity of oil the art of perfumery and cosmetics was built up, and none knew that art better than the old Egyptians.

The Israelites held oil and anointing in great veneration. Only the Essenes made an exception to this. These men forbade the use of oil, and became "unclean" by contact with it.

The early disciples had received a mystery called

Chrisma, "Unction" or "Anointing", to which allusions are made by John and James (1 Jh 2:20, 27; James 5:14; Hb 1:9). It had been instituted by Jesus (Mk 6:17; Lk 7:38, 46; Jh 11:2; 12:3). The Roman Church has made this mystery into a sacrament for people about to die. Since Jesus did not believe in death, he instituted this sacrament, of course, for the living, to help men to live, and to cure the sick that they should not need to die. Careful instructions on the Kingdom was a part of this mystery, and its mystic character appears from the fact that not a word of this instruction was written down.

Messiah.

Messiah was The Spirit. We will designate it as the Christ-Spirit, a Spiritual entity with which Jesus was endowed. His name became therefore *Jesus Christ*, "the Anointed Jesus."

This descent of The Spirit meant the birth of the Messiah. The Spirit was pre-existing with God, but was manifested in Jesus immediately after his baptism, and it abode upon him thereafter for ever.

This was confirmed from heaven, "Thou art my Son." This expression occurs already in Ps 2:7, a Messianic prophecy, followed by the words "I have begotten thee this day." The same words occur also in some manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke, and though these words most probably were not heard at the baptism, it is certain that the early disciples connected the "birth" or manifestation of the Messiah with the baptism of Jesus.

The Epiphany.

The date of the baptism of Jesus was by an early tradition fixed to January 6, probably in the year 33 A.D., and the event was called *Epiphania*, the "manifestation" of the Christ.

The significance of the Epiphany lies therein, that as Jesus received divine "power" at the birth of The Son of God, when he was dedicated to the Lord in the Temple, so he received "authority" by the descent of The Spirit at his baptism.

The Prince of Peace had become King of Truth, with "power and authority" to act.

Titles of Messiah.

The Messianic prophecies heralded the advent of the Messiah under a multitude of names and titles. We shall at this occasion call attention only to one of these titles, the "Rock", or "Rock of Ages", because the interpretation of it has become so perverted and misleading, that it has entirely lost its original significance. From Rome down to the sect of yesterday — most, if not all, churches claim to be founded upon the "Rock", and that Rock is supposed to be the apostle Peter — a lamentably weak foundation, indeed, if true. The wonder is that any church should want to hail its origin from a weak man, when there is a "Rock of Ages" to build upon. Can it be that the churches really want to say, that they are mere human organizations, that they were never founded by Jesus, and do not care for a divine foundation? If not, why should the churches gloat over a foundation upon a weak Apostle? But let us forget the churches and inquire about the Assembly of Jesus. The time is truly ripe for re-opening this question and test this absurd interpretation, that Peter should be the Rock upon which the Assembly of Jesus is founded.

The Rock.

It might be well to grasp and understand the fundamental facts connected with the occasion when this important word was used by Jesus, and what meaning was attached to it at the time it was first used.

The Master had withdrawn with his disciples into the region around Caesarea Philippi. He often took such retreats with his disciples, when he was ready to initiate them into some mystery of the Kingdom. The real facts of such retreats were, of course, kept rigidly secret and communicated only from mouth to ear in secret gatherings "on the roofs" (Mt 12:27; Lk 10:3) to new adepts. In a few cases the Master permitted his disciples to divulge these secrets only

after his death, though presumably only to their disciples, as was the case with the mystery of the Transfiguration (Mk 2:9). Apparently the "mystery of the Keys" had been given to the disciples during the retreat to Caesarea Philippi, and in the course of this mystery Peter made the famous declaration, "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (Mt 16:16). The disciples were, as usually, again charged not to divulge anything of this transaction (Mt 16:20). Consequently no one of the evangelists, not even Mark, who repeated Peter's sermons, tells anything of this event. By and by, under the stress of the forward march of Paulinism, this secret which had been handed on among the disciples, leaked out at last, or more probably, was deliberately given publicity in order to counteract the Pauline upswing, for the purpose of regaining prestige to the Apostles. This tale appeared in a very late source which came into the hands of the editor of Matthew's Gospel.

This declaration of Jesus did not delineate a Church to be built upon Peter, or upon the faith of Peter, but an Assembly built upon the Rock and to consist of men who declare Jesus to be the Christ, The Son of the living God.

There is good reason to believe that it was Peter who made this declaration on the Messiah, but he spoke only in behalf of the disciples, for it is absolutely certain that Jesus included all the disciples in conferring the power of "remitting sin" (Jh 20:23). Some one simply had to answer Jesus' question. Upon this answer the Master informed them that the "Rock" mentioned in the Old Testament (Ex 17:6; Nu 20:10; cf 1 Cor 10:4) typified Messiah, and since Jesus himself was the Messiah, he was also the Rock. Thereupon, pointing to himself and using a pronoun which in Aramaic could only refer to the speaker, he added, "Upon this Rock (Myself) I will build my "assembly" (My Kingdom), and the gates of Hades (death) shall not prevail against it."

It was usual in such mysteries to give a new name to those that were initiated. The new name to Simon was Peter, "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter" (Mt 16:18). Of

course, they spoke the Aramaic language. In that language "rock" is *Kefa*. That was the word which the Master used of himself when he explained, that the "Rock" typified Messiah. But the Semitic languages, including the Aramaic, have the faculty of making a patronymic out of any word by adding an *i* or an *a* to that word. The grammatical term for this usage is called *nisbeh* by the Arabic grammarians, and the ending so added gives to the word the meaning "one belonging to." In Aramaic *nisbeh* was expressed by a heavy accent on the last vowel, if the word ended in *a*. *Kefa* became thus *Kefâ*, which meant "One belonging to the Rock." The words of Jesus had therefore this meaning: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art *Kefâ* ("one belonging to the Rock"), for"—and he pointed to himself—"upon *this* Rock I will build my assembly" (Mt 16:16).

In translating this into Greek, the author created a new Greek word, *petros*, for rendering the Aramaic *nisbeh* of *Kefa*. "Rock" is *petra* in Greek. *Petros* corresponds therefore to *petra* in the same way, as *Kefâ* corresponds to *Kefa*, and should in English be rendered "One who belongs to the Rock." This gives, of course, an entirely new interpretation to this passage on which the churches, and especially Rome, have built so much. It is, furthermore, to be remembered that if Jesus used the word *ecclesia*, "church", at this event, he did not use it in any other sense than that of "assembly" of the Old Testament sense. The huge structure, known as the Church, is not built upon the foundation of Jesus the Messiah.

It is scarcely needed to add that everywhere else, in both the Old and the New Testament, "Rock" is exclusively a title of Christ. Jesus knew, as well as we, that an assembly or the Kingdom, founded upon Peter, would be as weak as Peter was, vacillating, changeable, denying, even swearing to of never having known Jesus of Nazareth. What we need, and what has been needed in all ages, is "an assembly of the firstborn who are enrolled in the heavens" (Heb 12:23), that is, the Kingdom, which Jesus constantly preached, as stated by every early Gospel source.

ANGEL means "Messenger", Hebrew *maleach*, Greek *aggelos*, which comes from pre-Sumerian *An-Gal*, "great god." What we call angels were the "great gods" of ancient nations, because they had, to a large extent, lost sight of our idea of God as the "Fathers of the gods."

Angels could therefore be either human or supramundane beings. The chief of an Essene community was called "angel", and the members of that Order were as strictly forbidden to make known the names of their angels as they were constrained from divulging their secret books. The highest officer of a Johannine assembly was also called an "angel" (Rv 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14), and this usage was not only divinely sanctioned, but rested upon divine order.

Usually, however, angel designates in the Bible a divine being:

"He makes Spirits his angels,

And flames of fire his ministers" (Ps 104:4).

Angel of Jahveh denotes the "manifestation of Jahveh" in human form. Angel of God denotes the same. The angel of Jahveh came to Hagar at a well in the wilderness of Shur. Hagar was of Egyptian descent, and Shur belonged at that time to Egypt. We must therefore expect that Hagar worshipped Egyptian deities. "Therefore she called the name of Jahveh who had spoken to her 'Thou art god Reh', because she said, 'Have I indeed seen the back of Reh?' For that reason she called the well 'The Well of La-cha-Reh'—behold, it lies between Kadesh and Bared" (Gn 16:13-14). *Lachareh* is a corruption of the throne-name of Sesostrius III, *kha-ka-Reh*, which Africanus also rendered *Lacharis*. Jahveh and the angel of Jahveh are here identified with god Reh of Egypt. The angel of Jahveh appeared unto Moses in a flame of fire (Ex 3:2), but later on he told Moses that he was Jahveh himself (Ex 3:16). The angel of Jahveh appeared unto Manoah and his wife (Jd 13:3, 21), whereupon Manoah declared that they had seen God himself (Jd 13:22).

The Saints and the Sons of the Gods are two classes of angels, which form an intermediary link between man and God.

The Saints, "Holy ones", Hebrew *Qodashim*, seem sometimes to be inhabitants of the heavens, at other times mere Temple "devotees." "Holy" means "one set apart for the Temple service", or "one belonging to the Temple."

"Behold, he puts no trust in his Saints;

Yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight" (Jb 15:15; cf 5:1).

"The heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Jahveh,
Thy faithfulness in the assembly of the Saints"(Ps 89:5).

"I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold,
a watcher and a saint came down from heaven"(Dn 4:13).

The inference is that the Temple in heaven had its devotees
or saints in like manner as the Temple of Jerusalem and other
temples were equipped.

Sons of the Gods lived on earth together with the daughters
of the Man (Gn 6:2, 4), but did also appear before the throne
of Jahveh (Jb 1:6; 2:1). They were inferior to Jahveh: "Who
among the Sons of the Gods is like unto Jahveh?"(Ps 89:6).
"Give unto Jahveh, O ye Sons of the Gods, give unto Jahveh
glory and strength"(Ps 29:1). The three men in the fiery fur-
nace were protected by an angel whose "aspect was like a Son
of God"(Dn 3:25). Often the Sons of the Gods stand in paral-
lelism with the stars:

"When the morning stars sang together,
And all the Sons of the Gods shouted for joy"(Jb 38:7).

The expression "the congregation of God", where God
judges among the Gods (Ps 82:1, 6), is part of this angelology.

Hosts, Hebrew **Sabaoth**, denotes sometimes the stars (Dt 4:
19; Is 34:4), at other times the celestial "hosts of the angels"
(1 Ki 22:19; Lk 2:13). Jahveh is called the "God of Hosts"
(Am 5:15; Ps 80:4, 7), and "Lord of Sabaoth"(Rom 9:29;
James 5:4). Sun, moon, and stars could therefore make
obeisance before Joseph(Gn 37:9; cf. Jd 5:20). In the New
Testament the "Hosts" are called the "Powers of the Heavens"
(Mt 24:29; Mk 13:25; Lk 21:26).

Michael, "Who is like unto God?", is a prince of the angels
(Dn 10:13; Rv 12:7), and is also called an Archangel(Jude v.
9). **Gabriel** is another chief angel.

Guardian angels of both nations and individuals are men-
tioned(Dn 10:13; Mt 18:10; Acts 12:15).

The Angelology of Paul included a classification of the
angels into "thrones, dominions, principalities, powers"(Col 1:
16), "rulers and authorities"(Eph 1:21; cf. Rom 8:38; 1 Cor
15:24; 2 Pet 2:10; Jude v. 8).

The Elemental angels, corresponding to our fairies and
goblins, are known: the angel of the water (Rv 16:5), the angel
of the fire(Rv 14:18), and the angels of the winds(Rv 7:1, cf
Wis 13:2). These angels function in the government of nature.
Paul extended this belief to all the "elementals" of nature(Gal
4:3, 9; Col 2:8, 20; 2 Pet 3:10f).

GALILEE, "the land of cromlehs", corresponds roughly to the lands of the tribes of Naphtali, Sabulon, Issachar, Asher and Dan. It is a beautiful highland, the mountains being mostly of volcanic order, and verdant valleys interspersed between the hills. It extends from the Mediterranean to the lake of Gennesaret. Formerly it was very fertile and thickly settled, in that respect forming a sharp contrast to the land of Judea further south. "The soil is universally rich and fruitful, and full of plantations of trees of all sorts... Moreover, the cities lie here very thick, and the very many villages, which are here, are everywhere full of people", says Josephus, the Jewish historian of the first century of our era (War III. 3. 2.) The mountains of Tabor and Carmel and their famous vineyards, the olive yards planted in every nook of the valleys and on the hill sides, the orchards, the fields and mountain slopes covered with fragrant trees and flowers—such was Galilee nineteen hundred years ago. For beauty of scenery and richness of soil this region had scarcely a rival in any land, and it was therefore well adapted to be the home of the Master, when he, before and during his ministry, went to meditate and pray, to preach and heal, in this bosom of a luxurious nature.

And the history of Galilee goes back to hoary ages, a history written with dolmens and cromlehs, with myths and legends, with hieroglyphs of many lands and ancient scripts. Ruins of ancient sanctuaries, and names of holy wells and fountains bear witness to a prehistoric civilization which age has not been able to delete.

The population of Galilee had for centuries been cosmopolitan. Since the time of Alexander, Greeks had mingled with Hebrews, Arameans and Babylonians. The Greek element was very important at the beginning of our era, which makes it extremely probable that the Master not only understood but could converse in that language. It is therefore not surprising that Isaiah(9:1; cf. Mt 4:15) called it "Galilee of the Gentiles."

BT201 .T55

Toffteen, Olof Alfred, 1863-
A forgotten religion /

BT
201
T55

Toffteen, Olof Alfred, 1863-

A forgotten religion, by Olof A. Toffteen ... Chicago, Ill., The Academic press, 1926.

2 p. l., 128 p. 23^{cm}. (On cover: Researches in Biblical archaeology, vol. III, pt. 1)

336781

1. Jesus Christ--Person and offices.

1. Title. II. Series: Researches in biblical archaeology, v. 3, pt. 1.

26-10873

CCSC/ej

Books by Dr. O. A. Toffteen.

<i>A Forgotten Religion,</i>	{ Paper	\$1.25
	{ Cloth	2.00

Studies in Psychology:

<i>The Freudian Theory</i>	.15
----------------------------------	-----

Reconstruction Sermons:

<i>The Cornerstone</i>	.25
------------------------------	-----

<i>Assyrian and Babylonian Geography, I,</i> Paper	1.00
--	------

In Preparation:

Myths and The Bible, New Edition.

The Academic Commonwealth.

<i>The Daughter of Pharaoh,</i>	{ Paper	2.00
	{ Cloth	2.75

<i>Psychology of the Superman,</i>	{ Paper	2.00
	{ Cloth	2.75

<i>Biblical Psychology of Sex,</i>	{ Paper	4.00
	{ Cloth	5.00

The prices include postage. Liberal Discount to Agents and Booksellers. Cash must accompany orders.

THE ACADEMIC PRESS

5220 GLENWOOD AVE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

An annual contribution of \$5.00 entitles the donor to one copy, free, of every book or pamphlet published during the year.
